HARVARD STUDIES

IN

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

*EDITED BY A COMMITTEE OF THE CLASSICAL
INSTRUCTORS OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY*

VOLUME XXVIII

HARVARD STUDIES

IN

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXVIII

PREFATORY NOTE

CONTENTS

ON THE SECOND BOOK OF ARISTOTLE'S POETICS AND THE SOURCE OF THEOPHRASTUS' DEFINITION OF TRAGEDY

By A. Philip McMahon

I. The Tradition of a Lost Second Book of the Poetics[1]

SINCE the Renaissance any treatment of Aristotle's *Poetics* has discussed and lamented the loss of a second book. Because this book, as we shall see, is supposed to have contained a theory of comedy, its loss, measured by the value of the Aristotelian theory of tragedy, is incalculable. An attempt to investigate the facts on which the belief in this loss is based, and to determine its reliability is, therefore, of fundamental importance.

The belief rests on the observation that the *Poetics*, as it is now constituted, is incomplete, or rather fails to fulfill its apparent programme, being especially deficient in a symmetrical elaboration of its initial divisions. Such incompleteness is usually defined as the lack of an entire second book.

I

A direct statement that there were two books is to be found in the list of Aristotle's works given by Diogenes Laertius in his life of the philosopher.[2] By this evidence, Bywater holds,[3] " the fact is sufficiently assured," although " we have no further direct testimony to the existence of a Second Book." There is, however, the statement of the so-called Anonymus Menagii, to be identified probably with

---

[1] The materials in this article formed part of a dissertation, *The Mediaeval Conception of Comedy and Tragedy*, submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D. at Harvard University in 1916. I am under obligations for suggestions and help, to Professors C. N. Jackson, W. H. Schofield, and especially to Professor E. K. Rand.

[2] V. Rose, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta* (Teubner), Leipzig, 1886, p. 6, l. 83.

[3] Ingram Bywater, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, Oxford, 1909, p. xx.

Hesychius,[1] where two books are mentioned.[2]   This evidence is also accepted by von Christ as establishing the existence of the second book.[3] In the third place, there is the additional testimony of the only other early index of Aristotle's works, in the "fragments of a philosopher of Ptolemy's reign," where there is mention of two books " de arte poetica secundum disciplinam Pythagorae eiusque sectatorum placita." [4] This is explained by Wenrich,[5] and accepted by Rose,[6] as being a confusion between Aristotle's two books of the *Poetics* and a work on Pythagoras, but nevertheless corroborating the evidence of the other two lists.

Zeller cites the evidence of all three lists to prove that the *Poetics* as we have it is only a fragment.[7] The relation of the three is declared by Rose [8] to be as follows: Andronicus made a list of the works of Aristotle in his books on the Aristotelian philosophy; an unknown philosopher of the time of Ptolemy did the same, with certain changes, but using the same basis; Favorinus then derived from Andronicus in his commentaries, upon which Diogenes and also Hesychius relied.

2

Although the direct assertions of the existence of two books are comparatively few, many statements indicate that there were more than one. Most important in this class of evidence is, of course, that to be found in the other works of the philosopher, especially in the *Rhetoric*. In all of these the definite article is used in the plural when reference is made to the *Poetics*.

In the first book of the *Rhetoric* Aristotle refers to the books of the *Poetics* for a discussion of the ridiculous.[9] In the third book of the *Rhetoric*, again with apparent reference to the ridiculous, a treatment

---

[1] E. Zeller, *Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics*, trans. from *Philosophy of the Greeks* by B. F. C. Costelloe and J. H. Muirhead, 2 vols., London, 1897, i, p. 48, n. 3.

[2] Rose, *Fragm.*, pp. 13, 75.

[3] W. von Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, 5th ed., W. Schmid, Munich, 1908, i, p. 702, n. 4.

[4] V. Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus*, Leipzig, 1863, pp. 79, 80.

[5] J. G. Wenrich, *De Auctorum Graecorum versionibus . . . commentariis commentatio*, Leipzig, 1842, p. 143.

[6] Rose, *Arist. Pseud.*, p. 194.

[7] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 102, n. 2.

[8] Rose, *op. cit.*, pp. 8 ff.

[9] *Rhetoric*, 1, 11, 1371 B 33.

of that subject is omitted on the ground that it already exists in the books of the *Poetics*.[1] In the same part of the *Rhetoric* a cross-reference is given to the books of the *Poetics* — to chapter 22, so Jebb believes.[2] A little later in this section another reference is made to the books of the *Poetics* — chapter 21 according to Jebb.[3] A few paragraphs further on, another reference is made, for a treatment of diction, to the books of the *Poetics*, corresponding, like the two immediately preceding, to chapters 21 and 22.[4] In still another place we have a reference, like that in the first, to the books of the *Poetics* for a treatment of the ridiculous.[5]

In the *Politics*, also, Aristotle, speaking of the term κάθαρσις promises to discuss it more fully in the books on *Poetics*.[6] The evidence presented by all this testimony is certainly of great weight.

Besides the indications of Aristotle's own works we have the implications of some of the early commentators on the philosopher. Ammonius, probably of the fifth century, in his work on the *De Interpretatione*, refers to the *Poetics* in the plural.[7] This comment is taken by Vahlen to refer to chapter 20,[8] and is cited by Zeller [9] to support the tradition of a lost book.

Boethius also treated the *De Interpretatione*, translating it once with a commentary in two books, and again, about 507, with a fuller commentary in six books.[10] In the second work he mentions "Aristoteles in libris quos de poetica scripsit,"[11] which is taken by Zeller to mean that Boethius knew a *Poetics* in two books.[12]

---

[1] *Rhetoric*, 3, 1, 1404 A 39.

[2] *Rhetoric*, 3, 2, 1404 B 5; R. C. Jebb, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*, ed. J. E. Sandys, Cambridge, 1909.

[3] *Rhetoric*, 3, 2, 1404 B 26.   [5] *Rhetoric*, 3, 18, 1419 B 2.

[4] *Rhetoric*, 3, 2, 1404 B 37.   [6] *Politics*, 8, 1341 B 39.

[7] A. Brandis, *Scholia in Aristotelem* (*Aristotelis Opera*, iv), Berlin, 1836, p. 99 A 12; A. Busse, *Ammonii in Aristotelis de Interpretatione Commentarium*, I, Berlin, 1897, p. 13, 1.

[8] J. Vahlen, *Aristotelis de Arte Poetica Liber*, 3d ed., Leipzig, 1885, note on *Poetics*, 20, 1456 B 25 (p. 45).   [9] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 102, n. 2.

[10] J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth Century B. C. to the End of the Middle Ages*, Cambridge, 1906, i, p. 253.

[11] Boethius, *Commentarii in librum Aristotelis* ΠΕΡΙ ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ (Pars posterior secundam editionem continens), ed. C. Meiser, pp. 6, 11 ff.: in libris quos de poetica scripsit locutionis partes esse syllabas vel etiam coniunctiones tradidit, etc."

[12] Zeller, *op.*, p. 102, n. 2.

The commentator Eustratius is appealed to by Bywater [1] as show-ing " that there was even in the latest Aristotelian schools some faint tradition of another Book," for, in his work on the *Ethics*, he speaks of a first book of the *Poetics*, and this may be taken to mean that there was also another, a second book.

Finally, the fragments of an early anonymous commentator on the *Rhetoric* employ the plural when asserting that Aristotle discussed the ridiculous in the *Poetics*.[2] The evidence on this score is presented by Vahlen [3] in a series of quotations that refer to Aristotle's treatment of the ridiculous. The words of the anonymous writer thus prove, accord-ing to Ritter, that Aristotle's work *On Poets*, which was in three books, was different from the *Poetics* in two.[4]

3

There are in Aristotle and elsewhere grounds for believing that certain matters spoken of as treated in the *Poetics*, but not found there now, were once to be read in a second book. These references also indicate an order of the works, according to Ritter [5] and others, who think that the composition of the *Poetics* is spoken of as a future work not only in *Politics* 8, 1341 B 39, but also in the *De Interpretatione* 4, 17 A 5.

At any rate, in the passages of the *Rhetoric* which we have already cited, the philosopher apparently referred to the work as one already done. The close relation in general between the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics* is further established by the large number of correspondences of different sorts noted by Vahlen.[6]

Nevertheless, the explanation of katharsis to which the eighth book of the *Politics* looks forward does not appear to be sufficiently given in *Poetics*, 6, 2, where the word occurs only in the definition.[7]

There is no treatment of the ridiculous such as we should expect from various statements in the *Rhetoric* (1, 11, 1372 A 1; 3, 1, 1404 A 39; 3, 18, 1419 B 2). Thus, of the references to the *Poetics* in the

---

[1] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. xxi.

[2] Spengel, *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica*, Leipzig, 1867, i, 159, 15.

[3] Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

[4] F. Ritter, *Aristotelis Poetica*, Cologne, 1839, p. xi.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. vi.

[6] Vahlen, *op. cit.*, pp. 49 ff., pp. 53 ff.   [7] *Poetics*, 6, 1449 B 24.

Rhetoric, one-half find some counterpart, while there is nothing at all corresponding to the other.[1] Ritter decides such inconsistencies compel us to conclude that either Aristotle does not mean our *Poetics* in these passages of the *Rhetoric*, or else the *Poetics* as we have it (Poeticam nostram) " mancam ad nos temporum hominumque iniuria pervenisse." [2]

In the *Poetics* itself there is a pledge that is not redeemed to the satisfaction of readers, where Aristotle says that " we shall speak later about Comedy." [3] It is natural to suppose that the treatment of the ridiculous as the basis of comedy would have been found in the part of the *Poetics* which discussed comedy, and that if neither the promise of the *Rhetoric* nor that of the *Poetics* was kept, the reason would be the same: namely, the loss of the second book in which both were contained. The deficiency is explained on that basis by Gercke,[4] following Rose ;[5] and Bywater, in his footnote on *Poetics* 6, 1449 B 21, supplements Aristotle's words with the phrase " in the lost Second Book of the *Poetics*." [6] Thus Bywater is enabled to outline the contents of the second book as containing a further treatment of katharsis, and a discussion of comedy, in which the laughable would have been analysed as corresponding to the pitiful and the terrible in tragedy.[7]

4

The exposition of some other matters would probably have found a place in such a second book, according to most critics: in particular, certain aspects of the subject of comic diction to which there exist apparently two references; and, much more important, a defence of the drama against the censures of Plato.

In his commentary on the *Categories*, Simplicius quotes Aristotle on the subject of synonyms.[8] That this topic also stood in the second book

---

[1] E. M. Cope, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*, ed. J. E. Sandys, Cambridge, 1877, i, p. 224; J. E. C. Welldon, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*, London, 1886, p. 85.

[2] Ritter, *op. cit.*, p. vii.   [3] *Poetics*, 6, 1449 B 21.

[4] Gercke, "Aristoteles," Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, ii, 1, col. 1053. 27.

[5] *v.* Rose, *De Aristotelis Librorum Ordine et Auctoritate Commentatio*, Berlin, 1854, p. 133.

[6] Bywater, *Art of Poetry*, p. 149.

[7] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. xxiii.

[8] A. Brandis, *Scholia*, p. 43 A 13; Kalbfleisch, *Simplicii in Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium*, Berlin, 1907, p. 36, 13.

is a supposition to which both Bywater[1] and Vahlen[2] incline by placing it among the fragments on comedy immediately succeeding their texts of the extant *Poetics*.

The other reference is a puzzle presented by a statement in the lexicon of the anonymous compiler, called the Antiatticist, published by Bekker, which may derive in part from Orus,[3] whom Ritschl placed as early as the second century of our era, while Reitzenstein assigns him to the fifth century. The Antiatticist, in defending the use of the word κυντότατον, cites Aristotle in the *Poetics*.[4] The portion of the *Poetics* proper to this definition was, according to Bywater,[5] the lost second book.

A defence of the drama against Plato [6] would have been a feature of absorbing interest in this lost second book. In Aristotle's *Poetics*, as Spingarn observes,[7] scholars of the Renaissance discovered a satisfactory vindication of the claims of poetry against the Platonic and mediaeval objections. In Plato the objections were grounded in a metaphysical theory of imitation, interpreted, some would hold, in a narrow spirit. Since he conceived imitation as mere copying, and since he held to the theory of the objectivity of ideas, he allowed little scope for the representative arts.[8] If an object in nature is only a comparatively unreal copy of an eternal objective reality in God, the reproduction of that object in art is twice removed from reality, and if certainly false probably dangerous also.

After all, the matter is not entirely settled by the answer of Aristotle with respect to tragedy. Plato's objection to the drama as exciting the passions without providing a means of governing them is not fully

[1] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

[2] Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

[3] Sandys, *op. cit.*, i, p. 325.

[4] Cf. Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 81; *Antiatticista in Bekkeri anecdotis*, 101, 32 κυντότατον: 'Αριστοτέλης περὶ ποιητικῆς. ''τὸ δὲ πάντων κυντότατον.''

[5] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. xxiii.

[6] The relations of Aristotle in the *Poetics* to Plato have been well treated, with results clearly demonstrating the dependence of Aristotle on his master, in: Ch. Belger, *De Aristotele etiam in Arte Poetica componenda Platonis discipulo*, Diss., Berlin, 1872; Georg Finsler, *Platon und die Aristotelische Poetik*, Leipzig, 1900.

[7] J. E. Spingarn, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, 2d ed., New York, 1908, pp. 18, 19.

[8] B. Bosanquet, *A History of Aesthetic*, London, 1904, pp. 47–55.

refuted by Aristotle's theory of katharsis, as it is usually interpreted. It meets the Platonic objection only so far as it is probable that the possible vicarious aesthetic satisfaction without an inevitable impulse to moral action will find compensation in the generalizing character of genuine tragedy, which is one of its inherently moral functions. That is, tragedy gives occasion for a proper conception of life, and may thus issue forth in proper actions. But it is still possible for the passions to be aroused without finding a direct and immediate reaction appropriate to the character of the passions aroused and at the same time morally profitable. Clearer intellectual perception is not inevitably succeeded by improved ethical practice, and so James urges us never to allow ourselves an aesthetic excitation of emotion without a deliberately beneficial consequence in our actions.[1]

Whatever may be the correct theory of the effect of comedy on the spectators, the Platonic objections apply, it would appear, much more to comedy than to tragedy, and were in fact urged against it in the first place rather than against tragedy.

That a discussion of all the objections raised by Plato, with definite refutation of them, clearing away the difficulties just mentioned, was included in the *Poetics* is the judgment of many scholars. Although Vahlen opposed the theory, urged by Heitz, that this treatment was to be found in the lost ending of the *Politics*, he supposed that it was contained in a lost final chapter of the *Poetics*. Bernays, however, held that it was in the lamented second book, — a reasonable conclusion in view of the other arguments urged for the existence of that book.[2]

5

Victorius,[3] the first great editor of the *Poetics*, was, as Bywater notes,[4] the first to say that our *Poetics* is only part of a larger work. This opinion grew steadily; Zeller states it specifically as the loss of a second book, supporting his opinion with much of the evidence cited above.[5] Rose, in his work to determine the canon of Aristotle, finally

---

[1] W. James, *Principles of Psychology*, New York, 1890, ii, chapters 24 and 25.

[2] Finsler, *Platon*, p. 3.

[3] Vettori (P.) (Victorius), *Commentationes in primum librum Aristotelis de Arte Poetarum*, Florence, 1560.

[4] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. xx.   [5] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 102, n. 2.

listed the *Poetics* as having consisted of two books,[1] and Spengel also thought that there must have been two books.[2] In this supposition he was in accord with his usual opponent Bernays, who even asserted that in another treatise we still possess certain fragments of the second book's treatment of comedy.[3] Most recently of all, Bywater has felt justified in drawing up a sketch of the contents of the second book.[4]

The loss may be partly explained by the orthodox tradition of the vicissitudes of Aristotle's manuscripts. Sulla, according to this account, after quelling the revolt of Apellicon, carried off his library, which contained Aristotle's autographs that had already languished in the cave at Skepsis for a considerable period. Sulla entrusted these parchments to Tyrannion, and thus the edition of Andronicus was prepared.[5] If these incidents are accurately reported, especially the story of the unique manuscripts in the cave at Skepsis, these books ran great risks of destruction or neglect. As it is, there exists a total gap in the history of all the Aristotelian writings for a full century after Cicero. This is certainly due to the entire loss of all the commentaries of that period,[6] and a like fate may easily be assigned to the second book in case it survived previous perils. Rose argues that it was lost at a very early date since it was not known to the Arabs, Syrians, or other commentators, and must have perished before Andronicus, from whom he would date the present state of the text.[7]

Bernays, however, believes that the second book survived until the fifth century, chiefly because he finds at that time in Proclus a conception of katharsis, corresponding to his own deductions from Plato and Aristotle on the question, with which he overthrew the neo-classical doctrine in favor of a more psychological solution.[8] Hatz-

---

[1] Rose, *De Arist. Libr. Ord.*, p. 241.

[2] H. Düntzer, "Die Aristotelische Poetik und ihr Verhältniss zu den Büchern Περὶ Ποιητικῆς," *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* (1842), pp. 280, 281.

[3] J. Bernays, *Zwei Abhandlungen über die Aristotelische Theorie des Drama*, Berlin, 1880. (I. Grundzüge der verlorenen Abhandlung des Aristoteles über Wirkung der Tragödie; II. Ergänzung zu Aristoteles' Poetik.)

[4] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. xxiii.

[5] R. Shute, *On the History of the Process by which the Aristotelian Writings Arrived at their Present Form*, Oxford, 1888, pp. 47, 48.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 66.

[7] Rose, *De Arist. Libr. Ord.*, p. 133.   [8] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. xxi.

feld and Dufour go so far as to make the loss relatively recent,[1] because " c'est dans le second livre de cet ouvrage que les commentateurs alexandrins ont puisé la substance de leurs gloses sur les poètes comiques grecs et de leurs traités ' *de la comédie.*' "

II. The Tradition of a Second Book Criticised

The existence of a second book, assumed to be lost, cannot, in the nature of the case be absolutely disproved. By the logic of such a situation a universal negative cannot be absolutely proved even of contemporary facts. With the increase in distance from the time of the facts considered the difficulty is immensely increased. No amount of rational consideration applied to a complete collection of the available facts surrounding the point at issue — facts relatively few after so long a time — could guarantee the truth of its conclusions. Palimpsests from some remote eastern monastery, or the accidental find of some archaeologist in Egypt could easily overthrow the perfect theory of an investigator. It is the obligation of scholars, however, to erect such frail structures, based on a conscientious survey of all the evidence, with the humble reservation in every case, that the very paucity of the evidence must leave the structure frail. Thus, in a question of the kind we are considering, it is possible to weigh the value of the evidence and to judge the tradition which asserts that there was a second book of the *Poetics*. Then, while we are, by the conditions of the problem prevented from making a categorical denial, we can, I feel sure, assert that sufficient reason cannot be shown to warrant the belief that such a book ever existed. All the conditions of the problem are more completely satisfied, on the basis of existing evidence, by the hypothesis that there was no second book of the *Poetics*.

I

To begin with, the whole tradition depends too largely on the evidence of the indices, the value of which, under the scrutiny of close criticism, can be shown to be only limited.

---

[1] A. Hatzfeld and M. Dufour, *La Poétique d'Aristote*, Lille, 1899, p. vii.

That Andronicus did make a list may be accepted without hesitation [1] on the evidence of Porphyry in his life of Plotinus.[2] That these πίνακες were copied in turn by Favorinus, from whom Diogenes Laertius obtained his list, is the theory of scholars as different as Rose and Bernays, whereas Shute holds that these inferences can be disproved.[3] There is a great gulf between admitting that Andronicus did make a list, and that the lists we have reproduce him, especially when there is grave doubt about their intrinsic value, and whether their authorship cannot with safety be assigned to another ancient scholar.

It is hard on general principles to believe that the lack of order and arrangement in Diogenes's list could have been the result of the otherwise admirable scholarship of Andronicus.[4] The weight of evidence shows rather that there is probably no relation between the index compiled by Andronicus and the one furnished by Diogenes.[5]

In the first place, although Diogenes cites Aristotle frequently, he does not follow his own list, but by implication appears to have used the same canon as his predecessors and contemporaries.[6] How could he refer to the third book of the *Poetics*, when he had already said in his list that there were two?[7] Indeed, Diogenes's list contains comparatively few works, among his lengthy enumerations of titles, that we can now accept as genuinely Aristotelian.[8] On poetry alone Diogenes ascribes five separate treatises to Aristotle,[9] and he seems elsewhere to have confused the *Poetics* and the dialogue *On Poets*.[10] In him we see clearly the beginnings of the process by which, through including forgeries, variant editions of the same work, editions of separate portions of whole treatises bearing another title, pupils' notes, enlargements of later commentators, and other accretions, David the Armenian found a thousand different works ascribed to Aristotle in the libraries of the Ptolemies.[11]

[1] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

[2] A. Kirchhoff, *Plotini Opera*, Leipzig, 1856, p. xxxix.

[3] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

[4] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

[5] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 49.

[6] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

[7] Ritter, *op. cit.*, p. x, n.

[8] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[9] Rose, *Fragm.* pp. 3 ff: 2, 83, 118, 119, 136.

[10] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 76; Diog. Laert., 8, 57. Cf. Diog. Laert., 3, 48 (pp. 77, 78), and 2, 46 (p. 79).

[11] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

The compiler of the list given by Diogenes, because of its inclusive-
ness, was probably an Alexandrine scholar.[1] In this conclusion most
critics, except Rose,[2] agree, especially since Hermippus may be desig-
nated its author.[3] A clue is afforded by Diogenes himself who,
immediately before giving a list of the works of Theophrastus, cites
Favorinus and distinctly states that the source of Favorinus was
Hermippus.[4] Since the origin of his list for Aristotle may have been
similar, it would be easy to explain its character, whatever the addi-
tions by Favorinus or Diogenes, as merely a librarian's list of the titles
borne by books in a library.

The works mentioned by ancient authors other than the compilers
of these lists, however, generally correspond to what we now possess,
and Cicero's statement of the range of Aristotle's works squares with
our canon.[5] Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses virtually the same text
that we now have,[6] and while Galen's canon is identical with ours
except for a few lost works, the roll of the missing does not include a
second book of the *Poetics*.[7] Thus, while from the time of Cicero on,
the successors of the editors Tyrannion and Andronicus refer to a
uniform body of works nearly equivalent to our canon, of the works
which Diogenes mentions, hardly any, except the dialogues, can be
identified in the works we possess.[8]

The index of Hesychius is plainly, as Rose points out,[9] only a copy
of Diogenes, with the suppression of certain repeated titles, and the
addition of some more names, as incapable of identification as of belief.
Altogether Hesychius managed to accumulate thirteen different titles
which might have had to do with poetry.[10]

The index of the unknown philosopher in the time of Ptolemy is at
once dismissed by Bywater and most other recent critics.[11] Its devious

---

[1] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 51.

[2] Rose tries to maintain the patently inconsistent position that the Aristotelian
works and canon were always just as we have them, and that we have them all.

[3] Sandys, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 122 ff.

[4] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

[5] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 51. Cf. Cicero, *De Fin.*, 5, 4, 9 ff.

[6] Sandys, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 279 ff.; Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 77. [8] *Op. cit.*, p. 86.

[9] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 11, n. 1.

[10] *Op. cit.*, pp. 11 ff. [11] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. xx.

history and the evident consequences of frequent mistranslation make it practically negligible when the significance of the other lists has entirely disappeared.

2

We may now approach the question from another point of view. If various passages can be adduced to prove that there were two books of the *Poetics*, a number can also be brought forward in which one is assigned as the number of books in that work. Of course, it must be admitted in fairness, that the singular of the definite article has not the conclusive force possessed by the use of the plural. It is, indeed, possible to refer to the book of the *Poetics*, meaning the one which I have in mind, without asserting that there is only one book; but the use of the plural carries with it the inevitable consequence that there was more than one book, and not less than two. Yet, if the occurrences of the singular alone are sufficiently numerous and of value in themselves, their significance cannot be ignored.

Zeller cites Alexander Aphrodisiensis as using the expression ἐν τῷ περὶ ποιητικῆς which he takes to indicate that Alexander knew only one book.[1] Zeller, however, apparently did not examine the passage to note the confused reading. In the Berlin edition it was noticed that Alexander's reference in this same passage to the *Rhetoric* is to be found in the *Poetics* instead.[2] Following an emendation proposed by Vahlen, Wallies solved the difficulty by bracketing the reference to the *Poetics*, and allowing the mistaken reference to the *Rhetoric* to stand.[3] We have here probably only a case where the original mistake of the author or an early copyist was corrected by a succeeding scribe, to creep in later along with the mistake. This passage, then, does not prove that Alexander knew only one book of the *Poetics*; rather, that some scribe of the third century or later, knew only one.

David the Armenian,[4] probably in the fifth century, uses the singular in a passage where he speaks of other works by titles in the plural. Hermias,[5] another pupil of Syrianus, was the father of Ammonius, the

---

[1] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 102, n. 2.
[2] IV, (*Scholia in Arist.*), 299 B 44.
[3] Wallies, *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis Sophistichos Elenchos Commentarium*, Berlin, 1898, pp. 33, 26.
[4] Sandys, *op. cit.*, i, p. 76.   [5] Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

pupil of Proclus, and he uses the expression ἐν τῷ περὶ ποιητικῆς.[1] This is one of the pieces of evidence presented by Zeller to show a divergence of tradition.[2] Here we have an apparent difference of opinion even within a family of scholars, since Ammonius, the son, used the plural in spite of his father's singular. Hence Zeller's observation that the more ancient authorities were acquainted with two books and the modern with only one loses some of its force.

When Simplicius, in his reference to synonyms,[3] speaks of *the* book, it may be that he vaguely recollected that some matters of diction were taken up in the *Poetics*. Whatever the value of his citation of Aristotle in this connection, it is clear that he thought of the *Poetics* as one book.

Disobedience to his father secured for Ammonius disloyalty in his own pupil Philoponus, for the latter agreed with his master's progenitor and used the singular.[4]

An Arabic commentator, Alfarabi,[5] in the tenth century, also used the singular regarding the *Poetics*, but his allusion was mistaken.[6]

Eustratius, it will be remembered, was cited by Bywater to prove that when that author speaks of a first book of the *Poetics*, he implies there was a second. Now, as I shall show later, neither the titles nor the numbers of books have any definite meaning for us because of the absolutely conflicting statements with regard to them, so that no inference can be made from the title to the number or vice-versa, and thus the mention of a first book in connection with a work called the *Poetics* by no means proves that there was more than one book in the work we have agreed to call the *Poetics*. The only safe method is to see whether the content of a given quotation corresponds to the nature of the works we have agreed to call the *Poetics* — a technical treatise,— or to the work *On Poets* — a dialogue. Such examination of the com-

---

[1] F. Ast, *Platonis Phaedrus* (contains also the scholia of Hermias), Leipzig, 1810, p. 111.

[2] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 102, n. 2.

[3] *Op. cit.*, i, p. 102, n. 2.

[4] Hayduck, *Ioannis Philoponi in Aristotelis De Anima Libros Commentaria*, Berlin, 1897, p. 269, l. 28.

[5] Sandys, *op. cit.*, i, p. 395.

[6] Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 3. "Alfarabius interprete Schmoeldersio docum. philos. Arabum p. 21, *de demonstratione omnino fallaci disseritur in ipsius libro de arte poetica*."

plete passage to which Bywater refers shows clearly that it points to what we choose to call *On Poets*.[1] If the term *first* proves anything, it only shows that there was more than one book in either the *Poetics* or *On Poets*, and the balance of evidence inclines towards *On Poets*.

One of the citations, from an anonymous commentator on the *Rhetoric*, is used to prove the existence of a second book, but another commentator, also anonymous, in paraphrasing his passage of the *Rhetoric*, uses the singular of the *Poetics*.[2] Both had the text of the *Rhetoric* before them, but where our extant version has the plural, commentators could still vary when their works were composed.

3

In spite of the reasons brought forward to explain the loss of a second book of the *Poetics*, the difficulties in accounting for this disaster lead more easily to the conclusion that it never existed. The awkwardness of attempts to make the loss plausible become more apparent when it is recollected that the tradition assumes definite shape only since the time of Vettori. Thus Bywater says,[3] " As for Book II, one thing is quite clear, that it was wanting in the common archetype of Σ, the MS. before the eighth century Syriac translator, and A^c, our oldest Greek MS. We cannot fix the date of its disappearance; it is practically certain, however, that the loss must have occurred during the papyrus period of the text, when Book II was still on a separate roll, so as to be easily detached from Book I, which was on another roll."

Bywater, however, also acknowledges that there is no evidence to show that later grammarians had any information about the second book or the theory of comedy supposed to be contained in it, while there is, on the other hand, evidence to show that it was unknown to them. The history of the existing book in classical times is indeed obscure to the point of ignorance, and although Bywater thinks that much of the teaching of the *Poetics* and its terminology were repro-

---

[1] Heylbut, *Eustratii et Michaelis et Anonyma in Ethica Nicomachea Commentaria,* Berlin, 1892, p. 320, l. 36. Cf. Bywater, *op. cit.,* p. xxi.

[2] Rabe, *Anonymi et Stephani in Artem rhetoricam commentaria,* Berlin, 1896, p. 259. Cf. p. ix.

[3] Bywater, *op. cit.,* p. xxi.

duced in the later literature of compilation,[1] the amount is at best small and comparatively late, so that the work must have been either ignored or little studied.

Neither Dionysius of Halicarnassus nor Quintilian knew the *Poetics* at all,[2] and Bywater confesses that in Byzantine times the second book was completely forgotten.[3] Strabo, who flourished at about the same time as Dionysius, has nothing to say about Aristotle which can be verified, not excepting his story of the Aristotelian library; and he does not mention the *Poetics*.[4]

There is, indeed, a passage in Themistius that Vahlen quotes in his footnote to *Poetics* 3, 1448 A 33,[5] which seems to parallel Aristotle, at least as far as the coupling of the names of Epicharmus and Phormis is concerned. In this passage of the *Poetics*, however, as in some other ancient writers,[6] the Sicilian origin of comedy is asserted. In 5, 1449 B 6, the names of Epicharmus and Phormis are joined in this same connection. The names, however, were bracketed in the text by Susemihl and succeeding scholars, and the reconstruction of the passage, clearly ungrammatical, was effected with the aid of Themistius.[7] While this process may be interesting in the annotation of Aristotle, it does not go far in proving that Themistius derived his knowledge from the *Poetics*, or that it was known to him.

Vahlen also quotes a passage from one of the scholia on Dionysius Thrax to parallel *Poetics* 1, 1447 B 18.[8] The point in question is indeed mentioned by Aristotle, but it is also mentioned by Plato and by other later authors who do not show any knowledge of the *Poetics*. Indeed, by reason of the language used, it is more reasonable to suppose that if the scholiast derived his idea directly from Aristotle it came from a passage treating the same theme in his dialogue *On Poets*.[9] In any event neither in Themistius nor the scholiast is there any trace of a second book of the *Poetics*.

Rose acknowledges that he is entirely unable to explain the loss, and falls back on the explanation offered by Alexander Neckham for

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. xxiii, xxiv.
[2] Ritter, *op. cit.*, p. viii.
[3] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. xx.
[4] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 68.
[5] Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 8, n.
[6] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. 123.
[7] *Op. cit.*, pp. 143, 144.
[8] Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 6, n.
[9] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 76. (No. 70; Diog. Laert., 8, 57.)

the disappearance of another work:[1] "Aristotelis viam universae carnis ingressurus subtilissima scripta sua iussit secum in sepulcro recondi, ne utilitati posteritatis suae deservirent."

The whole story of the cave at Skepsis is dubious, and the same considerations that make us doubt it also render unlikely the disappearance of so notable a work as a second book of the *Poetics*, containing a theory of comedy. It is, however, not so much the story itself as the value attached to it that is unwarranted. While the ordinary causes for the loss of classical works are sufficient, when definite traces of them at some previous time can be discovered, it has been found necessary, forsooth, to find a specific disaster for a unique manuscript to explain the loss of a work of which there is no definite witness elsewhere. That there are no surviving traces of a theory of comedy derived from a second book of the *Poetics* will appear in the course of this investigation, and we have reason to believe that, whatever the merits of the narrative of Skepsis, none of the scientific treatises of Aristotle were lost to the Peripatetic school.

Critics rely on Strabo and Athenaeus, with some aid from Plutarch, to compose the explanation that rests upon the tale of the cave.[2] Strabo veers slightly in the course of his narrative, for he begins by speaking of the libraries of Aristotle and Theophrastus, and then later talks of the sale of the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus by the heirs of Neleus to Apellicon of Teos. These books might, indeed, have been only the collections of these philosophers, but the remainder of his tale treats them as the original manuscripts of these authors. In the face of evidence elsewhere that Aristotelian works were in existence and that the Aristotelian school enjoyed a continuous career, Strabo's remarks that the Peripatetics lacked the genuine works of Aristotle is manifestly incredible.

In one place Athenaeus[3] speaks of a certain Roman Laurentius who collected the works of Greek authors including " those of Aristotle and of Neleus, who preserved Aristotle's books, from whom our king Ptolemy Philadelphus, having bought them all, put them together with those which he had bought from Athens and Rhodes and brought them to fair Alexandria." The interest of this city in Aristotle is

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 134.   [3] *Op. cit.*, p. 30.
[2] Shute, *op. cit.*, pp. 29 ff.

certain enough,[1] and the passage probably refers to the works of Aristotle. Athenaeus in another place, however, does not agree with his own statement, for he says that in the Athenian insurrection Apellicon took a leading part, a man who was originally a Peripatetic philosopher and had bought the library of Aristotle.[2]

The ready explanation of this state of affairs suggested by Shute [3] is that " no really published works of Aristotle were lost to the school meanwhile," and after saying of Aristotle that " Cicero mentions him over and over again as an author well known to all, and repeatedly attacked by the Stoics and Epicureans," he rightly exclaims, " if this is oblivion, what is knowledge ? "

Andronicus and Tyrannion, the editors to whom the works of Aristotle were entrusted by Sulla, do not appear to have thought they had the autographs of the philosopher. Nor does Cicero,[4] a close friend of Tyrannion, mention what would have been a great discovery if the missing manuscripts of the works on which the Peripatetics depended were suddenly recovered and placed in the hands of imme-diate friends for editing.[5] Indeed, Rome was the centre of Aristote-lianism from the time of Cicero forward,[6] and the character of that philosophy seems always to have been more congenial to the Latin than to the Greek mind. Not only were the editors Andronicus and Tyrannion residents of Rome or Romans, but Galen and Boethius, among the most important names in the study of Peripateticism, also dwelt in that city. Thus, with the great probability that, if there is any truth at all in the story of Skepsis, copies of all Aristotle's works were still in the hands of his students, the loss of a second book of the *Poetics* cannot be attributed to the damp and neglect of a cellar.

4

The evidence for a second book afforded by the cross-references in the works of Aristotle, not only for the number of books, but for the contents of the second, if such there was, is greatly impaired by a critical examination of such references in general. As a first step in this direction it may be observed that, if it is admitted that all the

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 30.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 31.
[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 33 ff.
[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 35 ff.; Cicero, *Fin.*, 4, 28, 79.
[5] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 50.
[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 52.

numerous cross-references are genuine, it must be supposed that the philosopher had a prearranged scheme of his whole system and its execution from the very beginning, that he carried this plan in his head both for completed works and for those not written, and that the titles preconceived by Aristotle were neither changed then, nor have varied since.[1] If, however, some of them may be genuine and some not, then their genuineness or spuriousness will have to be decided on grounds quite distinct from their mere presence in the text, and it is hard to see how they can well be used as immediate proof of the facts to which they refer.[2] This argument holds apart from my observation in a later connection, that neither the titles of the works nor the indications of the numbers of books have any constant relation to one another in our special question. Thus a reference to matters as being in the *Poetics* is far from proving, if we fail to find them there, that they were originally in the second book.

It may be urged against the cross-references in general that they are over-elaborate; that whereas there are comparatively few to works we do not possess, these are of a vague or doubtful character; that some of them between different works could not have been inserted at the time of whichever was the earlier; that in them the same work is referred to by different names; that in some cases references in the same work to other portions of that work contradict one another because they cite it as both preceding and following a given portion; that in some cases the references which act as connecting links between two adjoining books occur at the end of one of them and at the beginning of the other; that the references imply an arrangement of works in an artificial order which could not have existed until long after the time of Aristotle; and that they contain serious errors as to the real meaning of the doctrine which they cite or its relation to the matter under discussion.

The attempt to defend the references on the score that they were inserted in a second edition by Aristotle, or that they were repeated and enlarged with such additions, is more or less futile,[3] for the supposition that Aristotle ever prepared a formal edition of his scientific works is unfounded, and it is difficult to imagine a lecturer remembering so huge a course and at the same time making minute cross-

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 96.   [2] *Op. cit.*, p. 10.   [3] *Op. cit.*, p. 26.

references to questions far removed from his discussion both in thought and order.[1]

For a full exposition of these charges against the cross-references I can do no better than refer to Shute, whose fifth chapter [2] entitled " Of Titles and References " treats the matter thoroughly, substantiating by numerous instances all the difficulties raised above. He concludes:

" To sum up then, we find the titles of the Aristotelian books did not arrive at a fixed condition till some hundred years after the death of the master; that on the other hand the references assume all the titles as already fixed during his lifetime; and that even so they are not explicable, unless we grant further that he deliberately called several books each by two or three names; that he had planned out all his books before he began any, and carried all the details of books both written and unwritten in his head. Even these liberal assumptions will not get rid of all the difficulties, and the only satisfactory way of explaining the matter as a whole is to believe that all or the great majority of the references are post-Aristotelian, and that they proceed from editors neither of the same date nor altogether in agreement as to the nomenclature and order of precedence of the books."

5

From what has just preceded we have seen that the personal authority of Aristotle is not to be invoked for any of the references, and the motive of the editors who inserted most of them was at best to assure an acceptance of what they believed, rather than to state a universally acknowledged fact. The mode of composition and publication of Aristotle's works was, however, most favorable for the interpolation of such references. Indeed for their proper understanding his works required some such aid, so that in spite of natural reverence for the philosopher's text, scholars early inserted what they saw was necessary for the intelligent reading of the works, and the practice once begun was continued without system and with diminishing success.

The statement of the method of composition by Case is one of the most adequate.[3] After mentioning several hypotheses which he finds

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 98.   [2] *Op. cit.*, p. 96–116.
[3] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th ed., Cambridge, 1911, ii, pp. 506 ff.

himself obliged to reject, he continues: " Turning to Aristotle's own works, we immediately light upon a surprise: Aristotle began his extant scientific works during Plato's lifetime. . . . However early Aristotle began a book, so long as he kept the manuscript, he could always change it. Finally he died without completing some of his works, such as the *Politics*, and notably that work of his whole philosophical career and foundation of his whole philosophy, — the *Metaphysics* — which, projected in his early criticism of Plato's philosophy of universal forms, gradually developed into his positive philosophy of individual substances, but remained unfinished after all. If then Aristotle was some thirty-five years gradually and simultaneously composing manuscript discourses into treatises and treatises into systems, he was pursuing a process which solves beforehand the very difficulties which have since been found in his writings."

On the question of the publication of Aristotle's works, Case shows that printing has given us a wrong conception of publication, and that Greek authors thought of works rather than of books issued in succession on definite dates. Philosophers especially had for their public the immediate circle of their students, so that "it does not follow that his own works went beyond his own library and his school. . . . There is . . . no contemporary proof that Aristotle published any part of his mature philosophical system in his lifetime."

Any chronological ordering of the works is therefore uncertain, and the hints for such an arrangement given by the cross-references are useless. The double versions are results of the school, the heads of which were probably less daring in their emendations of the actual text than the immediate successors of Aristotle, but found it better for the prestige of the school that the scientific works should not be published.[1] Thus the distinction between the esoteric and exoteric works grew up, the latter, which were probably the dialogues in a literary form prepared for publication by Aristotle, being cast into disrepute compared with the esoteric works in the possession of the school. That most of these scientific works did reach a limited publication later through the eager purchases of Ptolemy and the seizures of Sulla did not prevent the growth of this tradition, especially in view of the superior elaboration and originality of these treatises.[2]

[1] Shute, *op. cit.*, pp. 8 ff.   [2] *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

While the professors of the Peripatetic school could not compare in vigorous originality with their master, natural stagnation and systematization made them rely more and more on lectures from the Aristotelian text aided by increasing familiarity with the whole of his works. In this way there would be evolved a set of references to facilitate their interpretation.

Again, although Aristotle abandoned the use of the dialogue as a means of composition, it is probable, even certain, that question and answer constituted a large part of the means of instruction, and probably the occasion of a more minute development of many points about which questions were raised in the course of time.[1] This explains the frequent anticipatory use of technical terms. If, then, he did not insert the questions to which a good many passages are plainly answers, it becomes still less probable that he would have inserted cross-references.

As Shute remarks:[2] " There would be moreover . . . a natural tendency among editors, who were themselves usually Peripatetics, to exalt the esoteric and unpublished works above the exoteric and published ones. We find, as we should expect, that references to esoteric works are much more common in treatises which were in vogue all through the period of darkness than in those which may be supposed to have remained unpublished during that time. . . . Thus they (the Peripatetics) talk of the dialogues under the general and somewhat contemptuous name of the external doctrine, without taking the trouble to specify what special dialogue the doctrine is to be found in."

But one of the chief reasons why any plural reference, apart from that of the indices, is unreliable is that nearly all the titles of works in the Aristotelian canon, both as drawn up in the indices and in other sources, are contained in more than one book. With such a practice in vogue it is not difficult to see how any vague or general reference to the *Poetics* could easily employ the plural article, especially when to this invitation to err there was added the existence of a dialogue dealing with related matters, plurality in the number of books in the

---

[1] It is interesting to note that the dialogue form was employed by Minturno in his Italian exposition of the *Poetics*. In the four books of his work he represents himself as conversing in succession with Vespasiano Gonzaga, Angelo Constanzo, Bernardino Rota, and Ferrante Carafa.

[2] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

dialogue, and a confusion of names between the tratise and the dialogue. We are reduced thus for any information about the second book and its contents to a search for any possible traces of it elsewhere. The investigation, however, can best be made in connection with a detailed examination of each of the references to the supposed second book or its contents.

<div align="center">6 ’</div>

Although the cross-references have in general been discredited, it is well, if we can, to account for them, and to examine each separately, as far as it concerns the object of our investigation. Among the possible sources, the distortion of genuine references is an unreliable hypothesis for any definite results. Nor are we on solid ground in a hypothetical work περὶ λέξεως,[1] portions of which appear to have been absorbed into the *Rhetoric*, and from which some of the passages in the *Poetics*, such as that on the language of poetry, may have been taken, with a general confusion of references after this absorption, and after this work had itself disappeared. Again, some of the genuine references may have originally alluded to the dialogue, and other references to them may have been inserted afterwards; these last are more practical possibilities.

The citation from Boethius *De Interpretatione* 290, is called a false translation by Gercke[2] in its use of *libris*, and in the case of Boethius it is clear that he used the conception of tragedy which, I hope elsewhere to show, was contained in the dialogue *On Poets*. The reference of Boethius, however, corresponds to our treatise of the *Poetics*, and yet, although he was acquainted with it, his definition of tragedy, I believe, is not derived thence. " *In libris* " may be a general expression meaning " in one of the books which he wrote about poetry," and so may refer to the work *On Poets*. This possibility is interesting in view of the fact that while Theophrastus is not mentioned in the *Consolatio Philosophiae*, the definition of the dramatic species which we afterwards find ascribed to that philosopher agrees with the idea of Boethius. It might follow that the Theophrastian definition which Boethius would have found " *in libris* " of Aristotle was derived by Theophrastus from Aristotle directly.

[1] H. Diels, *Ueber das dritte Buch der Aristotelischen Rhetorik*, Berlin, 1886.
[2] Gercke, Pauly-Wissowa, ii, 1. col. 1053.

One of the problems to solve is the reference of the *Politics* to katharsis. Though Aristotle had promised to discuss this topic more carefully in the *Poetics*, the treatment accorded it in the latter work is still inadequate. Of course, on account of the manner of composition, a pledge on Aristotle's part, even if the reference is genuine, guarantees not fulfilment but only intention; in fact Finsler find only one case, and that doubtful, in which a general promise was fulfilled.

Next, a highly technical and obscure theory such as that of katharsis would be just the one to attract the attention of an anxious editor, who could easily overstate the case, when all he really had to rely on was a repetition of the word in *Poetics* 6. Either his memory was poor or his intention unscrupulous, for it would appear much more learned to say " for a fuller treatment of this subject, see the *Poetics*," than, " there is another place where this idea is involved but left obscure." An editor is susceptible to just such temptations, and to allow an acknowledged obscurity to remain unilluminated by his learning may be felt a reflection on his editorial capacity.

That such a theory of katharsis was to be found in the second book and survived until the fifth century is the hypothesis of Bernays,[1] who attributed to Proclus an immediate knowledge of Aristotle's treatment.[2] The passage of Proclus he interpreted in the light of the *Politics*,[3] but as Bywater shows:[4] " It will be observed that Proclus refers not only to Aristotle but also to other apologists for the Drama; it is quite possible, therefore, that it was from one of the latter rather than Aristotle himself that he derived his knowledge of the Aristotelian idea of katharsis. And in the context in place of the Aristotelian term he substitutes as synonyms ἀφοσίωσις and ἀπέρασις — neither of these words being found either in this or in any other sense in the extant writings of Aristotle."

Vahlen goes so far as to affirm that the discussion of katharsis came after the discussion of comedy in the second book,[5] but Finsler shows that the source of Proclus's idea was probably Plato, and this probability is increased by the absence of a full treatment which the refer-

---

[1] Bywater, *op. cit.*, pp. 94, 95. Cf. p. xxi.
[2] Bernays, *Zwei Abhandlungen*, p. 47.
[3] Finsler, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
[4] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. xxi. [5] *Op. cit.*, p. xxiii.

ence in the *Politics* promises. The scholarship of Proclus, moreover, is generally uncritical.[1]

Farther, the explanation of katharsis which Bernays thought he discovered repeated in Proclus is doubtful, although it set men to thinking on the problem again. In objection to Bernays, Susemihl and Hicks argue:[2] "If we say that the 'painful emotion' of fear and pity is removed, we are reminded that the definition in the *Rhetoric* (2, C 5, C 8) makes each of these — fear itself and pity itself — a sort of pain (λύπη τις), although the emotions are generally defined as οἷς ἕπεται λύπη καὶ ἡδονή."[3] The proper explanation is certainly qualitative rather than quantitative, and the discussion by Susemihl and Hicks reviews the main positions on the question.[4]

There is the view, which is not very trustworthy, that the *Poetics* was intended only for the use of the school in lectures, so that the explanation of katharsis was oral.[5] It is likely, indeed, that if Aristotle explained katharsis, he did it orally, but we need not therefore rashly jump at the conclusion that the *Poetics* was only a lecture-outline.[6]

Margoliouth, indeed, thinks that the whole question is adequately expounded in the *Problems*,[7] and even if this work is not authentic, it represents an ancient view, and one probably nearer its supposed source than that of Proclus and Iamblichus. As Finsler points out, such promises frequently refer to later passages in the same work.[8] The *Politics* to a much greater degree than the *Poetics* demands a more complete development of its topics, and if we admit the hypothesis of lost parts of works, or unfinished works, the *Politics* would be one of them. If the latter part of the *Politics* were lost or left unfinished, a later editor might have changed the reference of an earlier

[1] Finsler, *op. cit.*, p. 3; Sandys, *op. cit.*, i, p. 373.

[2] F. Susemihl and R. D. Hicks, *The Politics of Aristotle, Books I–IV*, London, 1894, p. 652, n. 2.

[3] *Rhet.*, 2, 1, 8, 1378 A 21; *Nic. Eth.*, 2, 5, 2, 1105 B 23.

[4] Susemihl and Hicks, *Politics*, pp. 641 ff.; pp. 650 ff.; "Katharsis as an aesthetic term."

[5] Gercke, Pauly-Wissowa, ii, 1, col. 1037. 35.

[6] *Op. cit.*, ii, 1. col. 1053. 17.

[7] D. S. Margoliouth, *The Poetics of Aristotle*, London, 1911, p. 60.

[8] Finsler, *op. cit.*, p. 8 and n. 3.

one or of the author himself to another book where the word at least occurred.[1] Finsler, indeed, believes that the expression ἐν τοῖς περὶ ποιητικῆς, as it stands, refers to another part of the *Politics* in which the vexed question of the relation of aesthetic interests, especially of poetry, to social interests and the state, was discussed.[2] In any case, it is clear that a deliberate attack on Plato, such as some critics expect, would not have been in harmony with the general character of the *Poetics* in its close following of that philosopher, and would have better suited the *Politics*.[3]

The significance of the theory of katharsis was small in Aristotle's view, and the whole modern assumption of a complete theory of art in Aristotle is misleading. As Bywater points out,[4] the idea of a theory of art in general is recent, and goes back to a date no more remote than Winckelmann and Goethe. Aristotle's ideas on aesthetics were mostly those current in his own time. The modern preconceptions, the recent extreme interest in psychology of the physiological kind at which katharsis hints, and above all the splendid opportunity for endless scholarly disputes offered by so prominent an obscurity against this background, explain the exaggerated present impression of its importance.

The majority of the references to the *Poetics* in Aristotle's works are to be found in the *Rhetoric*, and half of these are capable of verification. In addition to this, it is to be noted that none of the references in the Aristotelian works ever specify a *second* book. But of those which are capable of verification, all correspond to passages in chapters 21 and 22. Chapter 20, immediately preceding, which begins the discussion of diction with a passage on the parts of speech and other grammatical details, Butcher considers [5] "probably interpolated," and he accordingly brackets it.[6] Chapters 21 and 22 continue the subject with special reference to poetic diction, and in chapter 21 there is a passage on the gender of nouns that Butcher also rejects. Although, as we have seen from the theory on Aristotle's method of composition, the inconsistencies that are here evident do not disprove the genuineness

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 8 and n. 2.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 8.
[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 6.
[4] *Op. cit.*, p. vii.
[5] S. H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, 3d ed., London, 1902, p. 3.
[6] *Op. cit.*, pp. 71 ff.

of the chapters in which they occur, it must be admitted that such looseness of construction made very easy the introduction of somewhat irrelevant materials, and the task of an early editor like Andronicus must often have been complicated by short, incomplete passages which were not closely connected nor capable of close connection with any of the set treatises. Such a conjecture is aided by the possibility of the inclusion in these chapters of passages from an earlier rhetorical work περὶ λέξεως. Ritter accordingly doubts the validity of the references in the *Rhetoric* to such matters in the *Poetics*, and attacks the authenticity of chapters 21 and 22.[1] Gercke doubts the authenticity of the end of chapters 12, 20, and the end of 21. He thinks them inserted under the influence of the later Stoic grammar in the third century, and holds the position of chapter 15 doubtful.[2] Ritter, indeed, devotes considerable attention to developing a theory of an interpolator and abridger in the *Poetics*.[3]

Cicero, at any rate, in his comment on this passage in the *Rhetoric* where one of the references to the *Poetics* occurs, says nothing about a second book of the *Poetics*, nothing at all in fact about a parallel treatment of the matter elsewhere.[4]

Diels elaborated the theory of the work περὶ λέξεως spoken of above.[5] He shows that Aristotle must have been the author, and that it was later combined with the two books on *Rhetoric* into the work as we have it. This theory provides some interesting possible consequences; namely, either that the same person who combined the περὶ λέξεως with the *Rhetoric* inserted some of the materials in the *Poetics*, and that this enlarged edition of the *Poetics* was not, however, the one which gained widest acceptance; or that early criticism rejected part of the insertions. If the insertions had been made before the work reached Andronicus, perhaps their partial elimination is due to him. These conjectures, however, only add to the reasons for holding the evidence of the references from the *Rhetoric* to the *Poetics* in slight esteem.

---

[1] Ritter, *op. cit.*, pp. 230–243.
[2] Gercke, Pauly-Wissowa, ii, 1. col. 1053. 48.
[3] Ritter, *op. cit.*, pp. xx ff.
[4] Cicero, *De Or.*, 2, 58.
[5] Diels, *Ueber das dritte Buch*, p. 34.

The references to a treatment of the ridiculous, moreover, may have been based on the *Ethics*, as was largely the case with the discussion in the *Tractatus Coislinianus*. Indeed, this treatise, manifestly of Peripatetic origin, and showing several different strata in its development to its present state, may have been thought to be a part of the original *Poetics* by some editors, and these references may actually correspond to it.

It is, however, the pledge, found in *Poetics* 6, 1449 B 21, to deal with comedy later that, next to the authority of the indices seems to impress most critics with the necessity for a second book. But this reference comes in at the head of a new division, in which the philosopher begins the discussion of tragedy alone, so that it was probably used as a connecting link, perhaps originally inserted in the margin, but afterwards creeping into the text.

Part of the promise contained in this passage of the *Poetics* is fulfilled to the satisfaction of critics, — that regarding " the poetry which imitates in hexameter verse," but the remarks on comedy in chapter 5 do not appear to these persons sufficient for the purpose of the initial announcement. Aristotle says merely: " I propose to treat of Poetry in itself and of its various kinds. . . . Epic poetry, and Tragedy, Comedy also and Dithyrambic poetry, and the music of the flute and of the lyre in most of their forms, are all in their general conception modes of imitation." [1]

There is a further possibility that, although the part of the reference which touches epic was correct, the insertion of the words " and of comedy" was a further addition, probably by a still later scribe after the reference to epic had fixed a place for itself in the text. This sentence comes immediately after some remarks on the relations of tragedy and epic, and following it is the series of chapters on tragedy. It is not strictly necessary, and without it the treatise as it stands would be self-sufficient and consistent.

Düntzer points out that the beginning of the fifth chapter indicates that the philosopher does not intend to discuss comedy further.[2] This reference is not a mere transition, but contains an essential step of progress in the thought of Aristotle, and does not bear the mark of

[1] *Poetics*, 1. 1447 A 1,2.
[2] Düntzer, *Zeit. f. d. Alt.* (1842), pp. 278 ff. Cf. p. 283.

the scribe. Here the writer implies that he closes the subject of the nature of comedy by connecting his observations with some preceding remarks on the object of imitation in comedy. In the treatment of tragedy, which begins in the next section of this same chapter, he does not refer back to the determination of tragedy's object, as he does for comedy, for the very reason that he has not closed the subject, but develops it more fully in the famous definition at the beginning of chapter 6. It is therefore only reasonable to suppose that Aristotle would not have connected his points at the beginning of chapter 5 with his philosophy of imitation, and then have stated his conception of the ridiculous in this place if he had ever intended to treat it later. This is a consideration which does not depend on the use of mere references of transition, but indicates a greater degree of coherence than is usual in most of the Aristotelian works, a merit which it could the more easily have possessed had it been originally short and self-contained, without the addition of a second book.

A further evidence of Aristotle's intention to finish up the treatment of comedy at this point is his balancing of various aspects of the subject, and thus a brief statement of why there is no history of comedy is set against an outline of the evolution of tragedy. Since, however, to his mind enough had been said about the aesthetics of a dramatic species in which he was not much interested, he parallels the later elaboration of his definition of tragedy with the cursory remarks on comedy at the beginning of chapter 5.

Still further, at the end of chapter 22 before the consideration of epic, which is promised in the first words of chapter 6, we read, "concerning tragedy and imitation by means of action this may suffice." Now, this sentence, by whomever inserted, whether by Aristotle or by the customary editor with his method of joining together separate portions of the treatise at this point, establishes several facts. One is that the writer judged that the discussion of all drama — " imitation by means of action "— had been finished when the treatise reached this point. Next, that more about comedy did not follow this observation. Then, except for the words " and of comedy," this reference in chapter 6, whatever its origin, was correct, for the discussion of epic is delayed by it until after tragedy; when tragedy is done, there is another transition, summing up the drama as a whole, and the epic

is taken up according to the announcement. Yet just as the latter reference at the end of chapter 22 states that here ends the discussion of drama, — περὶ μὲν οὖν τραγῳδίας καὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ πράττειν μιμήσεως, so the promise about epic, περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἐν ἑξαμέτροις μιμητικῆς is fulfilled, and at the very end of the treatise we find it said in conclusion:[1] "Thus much may suffice concerning Tragic and Epic poetry in general."[2]

As epic represented for Aristotle all the διηγηματική, so did tragedy represent all the forms of poetry which imitate ἐν τῷ πράττειν. There is also the obviously awkward connection of comedy with the designation of epic as the poetry which " imitates in hexameter verse " — one a conception according to medium employed, and the other according to the aesthetic principle, if " comedy " means anything in this context. It is possible, indeed, reasoning on the basis of 23, 1, that, instead of the word κωμῳδίας, the word διηγηματικῆς originally stood in chapter 6,[3] while another scribe, misunderstanding or disliking the word, inserted in the margin the word κωμῳδίας, and that this was substituted for the original.[4]

As already noted, there are no traces of the supposed treatment of comedy from the second book to be found in Varro or any of the grammarians. There is, indeed, the *Tractatus Coislinianus*, which Bernays held contained some reflections of that lost book. He himself, however, pointed out the secondary and derivative character of this reflection, and from that beginning, scholarly opinion has gone so far as to say, with Bywater:[5] " There is no evidence to show that the

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 283.   [2] *Poetics*, 26. 1462 B 8.

[3] For in 23. 1459 A 17 ἐν[ὶ] μέτρῳ corresponds to ἐν ἑξαμέτροις but διηγηματικῆς while more suitable than τραγῳδίας, is not its equivalent, although found in the corresponding position. There has been a good deal of doubt, indeed, as to the proper reading in 23. 1459 A 17. Butcher, on the basis of 1449 B 11 and 1459 B 32, writes ἐνὶ μέτρῳ, although the codices have ἐν μέτρῳ, and he notes the reading ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ of Heinsius. This last Vahlen also notes, but adopts the reading of the codices. Bywater agrees with Vahlen in his text.

As Aristotle seems to include all non-dramatic poetry under the term, διηγηματική alone is not the equivalent of that division, while, if διηγηματικῆς were there instead of κωμῳδίας, it would then present a logical indication of the whole field of non-dramatic poetry and of that part of it which is actually treated in chapters 23 ff.

[4] Düntzer, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

[5] Bywater, *op. cit.*, pp. xxi, xxii.

later grammarians knew of Book II, or of the theory of Comedy which must have formed part of it. But there is evidence showing it to have been unknown to them. The so-called *Tractatus Coislinianus* preserves a definition of comedy, which has no doubt a certain Aristotelian look; any one can see, however, by simple inspection that it is nothing more than an adaptation, or rather, as Bernays calls it, a travesty, of the well-known definition of Tragedy in the existing *Poetics*."

The enumeration of the parts of comedy is the same as that in Tzetzes, who appears to have got it from Euclides. But then, if, as some scholars think, Euclides was a grammarian of the classical period,[1] it only proves that neither the compiler of the *Tractatus*, nor the early grammarian had seen any second book. Nobody expects Tzetzes to furnish any reliable evidence on such points.

Nevertheless, while Aristotelian scholars have tested the *Tractatus* and found it wanting, the specialists in Aristophanes have in recent times become aware of it, and accorded it a more hospitable reception than it ever before received. Starkie relies implicitly on the findings of Bernays, and asserts:[2] " The value of this fragment was not fully realized till Bernays demonstrated that it represented a summary, mutilated and misunderstood in parts, of Aristotle's analysis of the laughter in comedy. . . . Rutherford alone has shown a due appreciation of its value." Later he reproduces with approval[3] the definition of comedy found in the *Tractatus*, and indulges in a laborious classification of " the various methods of exciting laughter employed by the writers of old comedy, especially Aristophanes," " according to the division of Aristotle," i. e., the *Tractatus*.[4]

What Starkie terms a " due appreciation " of the value of the *Tractatus* by Rutherford is rather immoderate zeal. He says:[5] " It is not that the laughter of comedy had not been properly analyzed. Even the scrimp and grudging abstract, now sole relic of the section in the *Poetics* concerned with Comedy, will convince anybody who keeps it in his head as he listens to Greek comic πρόσωπα, that a Greek had

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. xxii.

[2] W. J. M. Starkie, *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*, London, 1909, p. xxxviii.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. xl.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. xxxviii.

[5] W. G. Rutherford, *A Chapter in the History of Annotation, being Scholia Aristophanica Vol. III*, London, 1905, p. 435, l. 19.

indeed read for Greeks the most secret heart of the ' mother of comedy,' and probe in hand, had made clear wherefore it beat and what it was made of. . . . But Aristotle thought too much and was too great an observer to be loved by commentator and rhetor. Living at ease within their pale of words, it was not likely they would venture outside to be exposed to the perils and pains of thinking."

Rutherford dilates on the *Tractatus* and its application to the methods and interpretation of Aristophanes.[1]

Except for Kayser's recent treatment, it is Bernays who has offered the chief detailed discussion of the *Tractatus*; a discussion which is the fountain-head of the whole modern belief in the second book as a fact established to the satisfaction of scholars. He " demonstrated," as Starkie puts it, " that it represented a summary " only by employing in an extremely bold and often unwarranted fashion most of the evidence we have seen reason to reject.

Bernays first premises that, in order to establish the fact that Aristotle did treat comedy fully in the *Poetics*, the announcement at the beginning of the *Poetics* to treat all poetry should be taken in conjunction with the reference at the beginning of chapter 6 to speak about comedy later, together with the unsatisfied references in the *Rhetoric*.[2] Since these premises do not necessarily lead to such a conclusion, his case is thereby almost lost.

Bernays next gives the text of the *Tractatus* [3] and makes the following observations upon it. First, there is no unity apparent in the treatment except that of subject.[4] Next, the beginning of the *Tractatus* is unpromising because its division of poetry into imitative and non-imitative flies in the face of the plain declaration of the *Poetics* where Empedocles is even refused the title of poet because his verse does not imitate. In addition to this he discovers several other notable errors, from the Aristotelian point of view, in the *Tractatus*. First there is the employment of δι οἴκτου καὶ δέους for Aristotle's ἔλεος καὶ φόβος. Second, there is a balancing between fear and sympathy, whereas the *Rhetoric* expounds a theory according to which sympathy ought not to be ἐκκρουστικὸν τοῦ ἐλέου. Third, it is stated that tragedy ἔχει μητέρα τὴν λύπην. This assertion is based on the *Rhet-*

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 435–455.
[2] Bernays, *Zwei Abhandlungen*, p. 135.
[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 137–139.
[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 140.

oric, but in the *Poetics* Aristotle plainly speaks of a proper ἡδονή in tragedy.[1]

When he comes to the definition of comedy contained in the *Tractatus*,[2] Bernays exclaims:[3] " Diese seinsollende Definition der Komödie ist nichts als eine jämmerlich ungeschickte Travestie der aristotelischen von der Tragödie." The sentimentality of the statement that comedy has τὸν γέλωτα as μητέρα is glaringly repugnant to all that we know of Aristotle.[4]

There are, indeed, as Bernays points out, certain opinions on comedy expressed by Aristotle, especially in the *Poetics*, the *Ethics*, and the *Politics*, where the laughter of comedy is touched on.[5] But, as he also shows, later grammarians mistook Aristotle's views, confined to Middle Comedy, for the whole of the subject.[6] Thus the distinction between λοιδορία and κωμῳδία might have been derived in the first place from the *Poetics*, as the wording is not un-Aristotelian, except the expression ἔμφασις, for which Aristotle's equivalent is ὑπόνοια.

Section 5 of the *Tractatus*, Bernays proves, derives from the *Ethics*,[7] and the balance in section 6 between γέλως and τέρψις is modelled after the φόβος and ἔλεος of tragedy in the *Poetics*.[8]

To strengthen his case, Bernays at this point digresses on the probable influence of the Peripatetics on New Comedy, and of the relation of Theophrastus to Menander, saying that the *Poetics* agree in the main with the practice of this poet.[9]

Returning to the *Tractatus*, Bernays notes that the six elements ascribed to comedy are modelled on those attributed to tragedy by Aristotle.[10] The elaboration of this number of elements for comedy, once they were obtained, shows a surprisingly ingenious though superficial manipulation of other Aristotelian texts.[11] The pedantry of the achievement puzzled Cramer and other editors of the work, and the results move Bernays to term it " eine Verkehrtheit " . . . " je

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 141 ff.
[2] Kaibel, *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, i, 1, Berlin, 1899, p. 50, 3.
[3] Bernays, *Zwei Abhandlungen*, p. 145.
[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 147.
[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 148.
[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 150.
[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 151.
[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 151.
[9] *Op. cit.*, p. 152.
[10] *Op. cit.*, p. 153.
[11] *Op. cit.*, p. 154.

deutlicher der mechanische Weg zu Tage liegt." [1] The expansion of μέλος is believed by him, however, to point to a more complete work.[2]

At this point, however, Bernays feels justified in asserting that " Was über sie (die Komödie) daher der Excerptor in der jetzigen Poetik nicht Nachweisbares beibringt, darf füglich aus dem voll- ständigeren Exemplar hergeleitet werden, wofern innere Gründe nicht dawider sind." [3] But since, as our case now stands, genuine and inde- pendent traces of a theory of comedy must appear in the *Tractatus*, the contrary conclusion to what Bernays states naturally flows from his previous examination.

The division and discussion of the comic characters is, indeed, genuinely Aristotelian, but not independent, for it could all be found elsewhere than in the *Poetics*, and easily accessible to the ingenuity of the scholar who composed the *Tractatus*.[4] Thus Bernays is com- pelled to admit that: [5] " Vielleicht hätte ein glücklich spürender Scharfsinn, ohne weitere Hilfe, aber dann auch wohl ohne allgemeinere Zustimmung, blos aus diesen Stellen der Ethik und Rhetorik die nach Aristoteles an sich komischen Characktere auf die drei zurückführen können, welche der Excerptor nennt. Diesem wird nach dem Unge- schick das er schon zweimal bei Benutzung der Rhetorik gezeigt, Nie- mand gerade hier eine so glänzende Combinationskraft beimessen wollen; und wenn in Ethik und Rhetorik jene Dreizahl angedeutet scheint, so ist das nur ein Beweis mehr, dass Aristoteles sie auch in der Poetik aufgestellt und der Excerptor sie von dort abgeschrieben hat." Bernays then outlines Aristotle's probable treatment of the whole question of comedy, but acknowledges that " der Excerptor hat nur die Rubrik desselben ausgezogen."

Now when a critic makes capital of his deficits in this fashion he can prove almost anything. Differences in degree of pedantic acumen and in accuracy are easily accounted for by the assumption that the *Trac- tatus* represents not the work of one scholar, but an accumulation of the work of a number of rhetorical investigators. Of course the excerp- tor made gross errors in combining his scattered hints, but it is not necessary to suppose that he was the same who formulated the defini-

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 156.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 157.
[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 158.
[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 159.
[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 163 ff.

tion, and furthermore, it is not improbable that the same scrupulous pedant who succeeded so well in unearthing every available suggestion from Aristotle, would fail lamentably when he employed a merely patient and mechanical method to arrive at a critical development which it would have required Aristotle's own genius to make equal in value to the definition of tragedy and its relation to the principle of imitation. It is a weak argument to say that the defects of the author of the *Tractatus* prove him incapable of an investigation which demanded only care and patience, and that therefore the valid portions must derive from a book in which they were assembled by Aristotle himself. To contend that the excerptor gives only the headlines of the chapters of this second book is an interpretation which cannot in the nature of the case be disproved, but there has been no reason alleged why we should believe it.

Bernays's further remarks on what is said in the *Tractatus* about the diction of comedy only show, as he himself states, that this material too is derived from other existing works of Aristotle.[1] And finally, he produces the evidence of Simplicius on synonyms and of the Anti-atticist, with which I shall deal shortly below.[2]

Reich is one of the recent scholars who have discussed the *Tractatus*, and he relies on Bernays to support his own peculiar theory.[3]

Kayser, whose results in the matter are the most credible of all, fully reviews the previous investigations of the treatise, and attempts to evaluate them.[4] He also cites the particular judgments on the definition of comedy, among them that of Baumgart, who desired to ascribe it as it stands directly to Aristotle.[5]

As to the authorship and date, Koett suggests Remmius Palaemon, a contemporary of Varro.[6] Kayser concludes with the opinion that the source, of which the *Tractatus* is a summary, dates from the first century B.C., in the time of Andronicus of Rhodes.[7] The same scholar also puts forward the interesting hypothesis that the *Tractatus* and Diomedes derive from the same source.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 165.   [2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 169, 170.

[3] H. Reich, *Der Mimus*, Berlin, 1903, i, p. 249.

[4] J. Kayser, *De Veterum Arte Poetica Quaestiones Selectae*, Diss., Leipzig, 1906, p. 5.   [5] *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

[6] E. Koett, *De Diomedis Artis Poeticae Fontibus*, Diss., Jena, 1904, p. 49.

[7] Kayser, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

After thus disposing of the main points on which critics have depended for a theory of the second book, there remain only a few of the less important references. Among these is the reference of Simplicius to Aristotle for a treatment of synonyms. Rose, however, shows that this is derived from Porphyry, and in turn depends upon the reference in the *Rhetoric*.[1]

The allusion of the Antiatticist is very slight evidence in any case, and it is not at all certain that this anonymous controversialist referred to the *Poetics* in citing Aristotle. Even allowing this unknown writer the merit of honesty, we are not obliged to conclude that his memory was sound or his source genuine. The matter to which he alludes may possibly have been contained in the work περὶ λέξεως, afterwards absorbed into the *Rhetoric*, or even in chapters of it inserted in the *Poetics* that later editors rejected.

Bywater notes various anomalies of thought or language in the *Poetics*.[2] Among these he mentions: the anticipatory use of technical terms afterwards defined; variations of terminology; inconsistencies in the use of terms; inconsistency of thought; and lapses of memory. Yet he also defends the philosopher on the ground of his natural limitations, showing how the Greek play limited Aristotle's views by its conventions with regard to stage presentation, form and structure, motives and subjects.[3] His ideal play was a compromise between the drama of the great period and that of his own generation, seventy years after the death of Euripides. Among the evidences of this assertion that Bywater brings forward are: Aristotle's theory of tragic diction, and the silence about the chorus; his concessions in plot to the more sensitive feelings of his audience instead of the harsh situations of the older tragedy; and the fact that his theory of comedy would have been more applicable to the New Comedy than to Aristophanes. For the state of the text he has the usual arguments.

Bywater also records his opinion, however, that " the book as it is with occasional sidelights from other works is intelligible enough." [4] Now it is much more intelligible if we do not look for something in the *Poetics* which there is no reason to suppose ever was there, or to feel disappointed when we fail to find it.

---

[1] Rose, *Arist. Libr. Ord.*, p. 133. [2] *Op. cit.*, pp. viii, ix.
[3] Bywater, *op. cit.*, pp. xiv ff. [4] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. viii.

In the course of this investigation I have tried to deal impartially with all the evidence urged for the existence of a second book, and with the scholars who held such an opinion based on that evidence. The only direct statements that there were two books, those of the indices, have been considered; and those references have been given which indicate that there was more than one book, — from the Aristotelian text itself, from Ammonius, Boethius, Eustratius, and an anonymous commentator on the *Rhetoric*. In addition there were the matters supposed to have been in the *Poetics*, but not now found there, indicated by the time-references to the *Poetics:* the promise about comedy; the cross-references of the *Rhetoric* to the *Poetics* about the ridiculous; the incomplete discussion of katharsis; and the theory on comedy, reflections of which Bernays thought he found in the *Tractatus Coislinianus*. Further matters which might have been found there, according to scholars, were: a discussion of synonyms; a treatment of the drama in defence against Plato; and something on comic diction. This outline was followed by a brief statement of how the tradition of a lost second book began and was developed.

Against this case it was argued that all the three indices are unreliable; that there are also references elsewhere in which the *Poetics* is spoken of as contained in one book; that the inconsistent tales, especially that of the cave at Skepsis, and other expedients demonstrate the difficulty in accounting for the loss of the second book, which is easily avoided by a rejection of the supposition that there ever was one. Then came a detailed examination of the cross-references in general, where it was shown that they cannot be used as direct proof of any of their implications; and Aristotle's manner of composition and publication was discussed. The investigation was concluded with an analysis of the various references individually, with negative results as to their validity, including a refutation of the claim of Bernays to have found traces of the complete theory of comedy. The final result is a conclusion that there was no second book. While it is logically impossible to prove a universal negative, there is no reason for us to believe, in this case, that there ever was a second book; and the facts of the case are all harmonized and accommodated to one another without such an hypothesis.

III. THE DIALOGUES OF ARISTOTLE[1]

The dialogues were, as Shute observes, " the compositions of Aristotle with which antiquity was best acquainted, and for which, next to the Πολιτεῖαι, we have the best authority." [2]   Since there is abundant evidence from many sources that Aristotle used dialogues in the first period of his work,[3] Rose attributes this disproportionate influence of the *Politics* and the dialogues to the fact that, while the *Politics*, by reason of the range of subjects treated, were especially interesting to grammarians and historians, the dialogues, because they treated the questions common to philosophy after Plato in an easy, lucid and popular style, attracted not only the philosophers of the Roman Empire, but also the later rhetoricians.   Among these Rose mentions Panaetius, Posidonius, Andronicus, Didymus, Varro, Cicero, Dio Chrysostom, Julian, Themistius, Basil, and Plutarch.[4]   Indeed, the researches of Bernays, proving that by the exoteric works reference is had to the dialogues, show that, in view of the unbroken testimony of antiquity, the dialogues were Aristotle's in a sense that can be applied to none of the other accepted works in the Aristotelian canon.[5]

The references we have are mostly historical notes, and arouse no suspicion against their genuineness.   It is true that Fragment 76 contains a statement about Homer, apparently based on a tradition prevalent in Ios.   The questionableness of this statement cannot prove the dialogue spurious, for it is clear that an author does not necessarily believe all the statements put into the mouth of the speakers in a dialogue.[6]

The example followed by the master in dealing with poetry in dialogues seems not to have been an isolated performance, and we find

[1] J. Bernays, *Die Dialoge des Aristoteles im Verhältniss zu seinen übrigen Werken*, Berlin, 1863; E. Heitz, *Die verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles*, Leipzig, 1865; Schlottmann, *Ars dialogorum quas vicissitudines apud Graecos et Romanos subierit*, Rostock, 1889, pp. 19–25; R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1895.

[2] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[3] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 55, n. 2.

[4] Rose, *Arist. Pseud.*, p. 23.

[5] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

[6] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 58, n. 1.

Heraclides, among the Peripatetics, writing a dialogue περὶ ποιητικῆς
καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν α′.[1]   Indeed, Heraclides appears to have written a
number of works on the subject.[2]   He also probably showed the
influence of Plato here; and he is coupled together with Aristotle by
Dio Chrysostom, as being a writer in that form in which Plato was
the first.[3]

One of the characteristics of Aristotle's extant dialogues in which
they differed widely from his other works was their style.   That Aris-
totle himself estimated very exactly the literary quality of Plato's
dialogues we see from what appears to be a fragment of his dialogue
On Poets,[4] where he says that they are midway between verse and
prose.   A distinct and deliberately planned literary excellence was one
of the qualities that antiquity specially noted also in Aristotle's dia-
logues.   We may refer, for instance, to the passage in Ammonius
where the beauty and appropriateness of the language is mentioned,[5]
and to another passage in Elias.[6]

The style, indeed, was, as Themistius observes, the principal attrac-
tion of the dialogues for the readers of Aristotle.   Cicero, except for
the *Rhetoric*, does not, on the evidence found in his works, seem to
have read much else of Aristotle but the dialogues.[7]   His remarks
concerning their style suggest the same conclusion.[8]   Cicero's allusions
to Theophrastus establish similar facts for the style of Aristotle's most
famed disciple, and, as Zeller says, " In his case, as in Aristotle's, this
merit belongs chiefly to his popular writings, and especially to the
dialogues, which, like Aristotle's, are described as exoteric." [9]   It was
even said, though on insufficient grounds, by some of the ancients, that
Theophrastus received his name on account of his graceful style.[10]

---

[1] Rose, *Arist. Pseud.*, p. 77; Diogenes Laertius, *De vitis, dogmatibus clarorum
philosophorum libri x*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1692, 5, 86; 5, 88.

[2] O. Voss, *De Heraclidis Pontici Vita et Scriptis.*   Diss., Rostock, 1896, p. 31.

[3] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 24; Dio Chrys., *Or.*, p. 634, Emp.

[4] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 78; Diog. Laert., 3, 37.

[5] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 23; Ammonius, *Proleg. in Arist. categ.* (p. 36 B 28 Br.).

[6] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 23; Elias *in Arist. cat.*, p. 26 B 35.

[7] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

[8] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 23; Themist., *Or.*, 26 p. 385, l. 28, Dind; Hirzel, *op. cit.*, i, p.
280; Cicero *Acad. pr.* 119.

[9] Zeller, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 352, and n. 1.   [10] *Op. cit.*, ii, p. 348, n. 3.

Another known feature of the Aristotelian dialogues was their method. Cicero testifies that the speeches of other persons were so introduced that Aristotle himself was always the principal speaker.[1] This characteristic is otherwise described by Basil[2] as a practice of direct statement in distinction from the contrast of opinions employed by Plato.[3] From Cicero we also learn that in dialogues of more than one book, each part had its own preface.[4] On this question Proclus gives similar information.[5] From such evidence has also been derived the accepted belief that the dialogues were essentially distinct in form and method from the extant treatises.[6]

In support of Bernays's opinion that exoteric and published works are identical and refer almost all to the dialogues, may be adduced the practice of referring to the other works in ways which indicate that only the dialogues were considered finished literary productions and so worthy of publication.[7] Thus the reference in the *Poetics* to one of the published works is most naturally assigned to the dialogue *On Poets*, as Zeller remarks,[8] rather than to the *Rhetoric*, as Rose suggests,[9] since there is no corresponding passage there. Vahlen agrees with Zeller on this point,[10] and while exoteric may include some of the more popular of the really esoteric class, such as the *Rhetoric* and the *Politics*, we can reasonably infer, because of the absence in these of passages corresponding to references which require an exoteric or published work, that the dialogue *On Poets* is meant.[11] Thus, while the works still entire in the accepted Aristotelian canon afford little definite proof of the genuineness of the dialogues, the unanimous agreement of antiquity shows that the editors who inserted such references to exoteric or published works had authentic Aristotelian dialogues which they could have cited, and from the character of the fragments pre-

---

[1] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 23; Cicero, *Ep. ad Att.*, 13, 19.
[2] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 23; Basil, *Epist.*, 135.
[3] Hirzel, *op. cit.*, i, p. 275.
[4] Shute, *History*, p. 64. Cf. Cicero, *Ad Att.*, 4, 16, 2; 13, 19, 4.
[5] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 23; Proclus, *In Parmen.*, t. iv, p. 54 Cous.
[6] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 55. [7] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
[8] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 58, n. 1.
[9] Rose, *De Arist. Libr. Ord.*, p. 79.
[10] Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 36, n. on *Poetics*, 15. 1454 B 18.
[11] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

served, we believe these fragments to be Aristotelian and to show that
the dialogues contained passages corresponding to such references.
Furthermore, it is an equally reasonable hypothesis that references
to the *Poetics* which are not otherwise definitely accounted for, may,
on account of the confusion of *On Poets* and *Poetics* as titles of both
the dialogue and the treatise, correspond to passages in the dialogue.

Since antiquity great confusion has been caused by the similarity in
names between the *Poetics* and *On Poets*, one of them a formal treatise
and the other a dialogue. Allusions to these works are inextricably
contradictory, for with two works, each called by either of two titles,
and with references to both of the titles and both works as in from
one to three books, there are twelve possible combinations.

Beside the easy confusion occasioned by the close similarity of
names, the *Poetics* and *On Poets*, and a resemblance in subject-matter,
we must also reckon with the possibility that the dialogue, as the only
formally published work, received a title earlier, and that general agree-
ment on the title of the treatise was not reached in antiquity.

That the work *On Poets* was a dialogue cannot, as we have shown,
be fully proved, but if the treatise is by agreement entitled the *Poetics*,
then we must call the dialogue *On Poets*. The real question is then:
how did the dialogue differ in method and treatment from the treatise,
and what other facts are known about it ?

The orthodox view, with its inherent difficulties more or less glossed
over, is set forth by Rose,[1] and may be summarized in the following
manner. That the three books *On Poets*, which are mentioned near
the beginning of the index of Diogenes Laertius, were really written in
the manner of a dialogue [2] is expressly stated in the *Vita Marciana* of
Aristotle.[3] In spite of the confusion of titles, the dialogue is distin-
guished by having one book more than the treatise.[4] In the dialogue
were also discussed the art of poetry,[5] its nature as a kind of imitation,
its function in the state, and so forth, — all this incapable of demon-
stration by Rose's method of treating the evidence. If, however, one

---

[1] Rose, *Arist. Pseud.*, pp. 77–86.   [2] *Op. cit.*, p. 25.

[3] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 76; *Vita Aristotelis Marciana* (cod. 257) f. 276 A; Rose, *Arist. Pseud.*, p. 77.

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 77, 78; Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 58, n. 1.

[5] Rose, *Arist. Pseud.*, p. 78.

of the works was in at least one book and the other in three, and if there is no reason to suppose that the treatise, called the *Poetics*, was in more than one book, then the dialogue *On Poets* was in three.

The character of the dialogue is ascertainable with tolerable certainty. Hirzel shows that the dialogue discussed the relation of philosophy to poetry, and contends that, while critics usually consider it a purely historical work, excluding the theoretical discussion of poetry, they do not make it clear how the history of poetry could suitably be made the matter of a dialogue, even of an Aristotelian one.[1] The fragments themselves lead to an opposite conclusion. The examples were probably cited to sustain points of the argument as in the Socratic dialogues, and the fragment which maintains that when the philosopher rhymes or the poet philosophizes, either the poetry or the philosophy is inferior, indicates a philosophical discussion of a quite Platonic character.[2] Indeed, it is a purely philosophical distinction which opposes historical to poetic truth as the difference between particular and general truth, so that at the end of the Aristotelian dialogue Socrates, who first investigated general conceptions with worthy results, and Homer,[3] who above all others deserved the name of poet, could be brought together. This conjunction, as we learn from the fragments, probably occurred in the third and last book,[4] and the critical theory involved agrees with that in the *Poetics* and the *Metaphysics*.[5]

It has been supposed that the dialogue also treated the art of poetry, a supposition which would explain how the dialogue could sometimes be entitled the *Poetics*.[6] Bywater thinks that, at any rate, the dialogue did not devote special attention to the question of stage-effects.[7]

The relation of the dialogue *On Poets* to the treatise the *Poetics* has been several times discussed,[8] and it has been thought possible that many of the references to matters poetic which are not found in the

---

[1] Hirzel, *op. cit.*, i, p. 288 and n.
[2] *Op. cit.*, i, p. 288.
[3] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. 109. Note on *Poetics* 1, 1447 B 18.
[4] Gercke, Pauly-Wissowa, ii, 1, col. 1052. 63.
[5] Hirzel, *op. cit.*, i, p. 289.
[6] Zeller, *op. cit.*, i, p. 58, n. 1.
[7] Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. 233.
[8] Düntzer, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

Poetics might have been in the work *On Poets*. This hypothesis is
surely as valid and reasonable on its face as the theory that such
matters were to be found in a second book of the *Poetics*. Two
of the parallels in Athenaeus to the *Poetics* noted by Vahlen [1] might
conceivably have been drawn rather from the dialogue, as well as
another parallel, also noted by Vahlen, in the *Anonymus de comoedia*. [2]
Moreover, the passage in Themistius, possibly, but by no means cer-
tainly, an expansion of information derived from the *Poetics*, might,
in view of his acquaintance with the dialogue, have more probably
been derived from the latter. Von Christ judges, finally, that the
dialogue was a preliminary discussion, followed later by a more pro-
found and technical work. [3]

The matter of the dialogue is broadly indicated in the extant frag-
ments. Much of the surviving material is not assigned to any particu-
lar book, but there are a number of cases in which the book is indi-
cated. Thus, in the first book there was a discussion of the dialogue
form and a reference to Plato, [4] a fact which is further established by
the evidence of Athenaeus. [5]

The second book, according to Macrobius, introduced the evidence
of Euripides on a question of Aetolian customs. [6]

The third book, according to Diogenes Laertius, gave an anecdote
about Socrates. [7] In this book, also, there was the discredited story
about Homer's origin, [8] and from these indications the matter of the
other fragments can to some extent be grouped in the different books,
so that we may now agree with Hirzel that the place of the passage
mentioning both Socrates and Homer was at the conclusion of the
whole work. [9]

---

[1] Athenaeus, 8, 367 B; ii, p. 302, ed. Kaibel; cf. Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 53, n: and
Athenaeus, 9, 433 C; ii, p. 442, ed. Kaibel; cf. Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 51, n.

[2] Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 13, n. on *Poetics*, 4. 1449 B 7.

[3] Von Christ, *Geschichte*, i, p. 674.

[4] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 77; Diog. Laert., 3, 48.

[5] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 78; Athen., xi, p. 505 C.

[6] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 78; Macrob., *Saturn.*, 5, 18, 19.

[7] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 79; Diog. Laert. 2, 46.

[8] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 79; fragment 76.

[9] Hirzel, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

IV. Theophrastus

Various sources [1] reveal Theophrastus as the chief disciple of Aristotle. His interest was mainly scientific, but even in science he strove to complete and substantiate the principles of his master, and introduced no radical differences. [2] As Boethius bears witness, he advanced further than Aristotle in fields which the master had but slightly touched; otherwise he accepted his teachings. [3] In the same place Boethius tells us that Theophrastus sometimes used the very words of Aristotle without change. [4] Cicero, indeed, points out that Theophrastus was more accurate in his observations, and especially developed research in natural sciences. [5] Cicero also thought Theophrastus a closer follower of the master than other Peripatetics, while Galen seems almost never to find any difference between them. [6]

Zeller points out that Theophrastus investigated the psychological effect of music and held that certain diseases could be healed by it. [7] The few fragments we possess of this discussion lead us to believe that neither did he differ widely from Aristotle in his theory of art.

There is in Athenaeus an extract from Theophrastus "On Comedy." [8] Zeller, however, holds that his citations from it are "quite incredible." [9] Whether we have here a mistake of Athenaeus or not, does not seriously affect the authenticity of the aesthetic theory of Theophrastus as a practical reproduction of Aristotle's. Athenaeus may have been familiar with the *Poetics*, as he evidently was with *On Poets*, [10] yet both the reference of 13, 608 E and that of 6, 261 D may have been derived from some intermediary historical discussion.

The canon of the works of Theophrastus is extremely uncertain since almost all of them, except some in natural science, are lost but for a few fragments. The list of Diogenes gives him a work on comedy,

---

[1] Zeller, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 348.

[2] *Op. cit.*, ii, p. 355.

[3] Diels, *Ueber das dritte Buch*, p. 26.

[4] Zeller, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 356.

[5] Cicero, *Fin.*, 5, 4, 10.

[6] Shute, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

[7] Zeller, *op. cit.*, ii, pp. 415, 416.

[8] G. Kaibel, ed. *Athenaei Naucratitae Dipnosophistarum, libri XV*, vols. i, ii, Leipzig, 1887, 6, 261 D (p. 81), and 8, 348 A (i, p. 263).

[9] Zeller, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 414, and n. 4.

[10] Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 6, n. on *Poetics*, 1. 1447 B 21.

and one on the ridiculous, but two separate works on poetics.[1] This last statement may have been a mere repetition on the part of a scribe or librarian, but it is especially noted in the list that the second is another work. Andronicus and Hermippus both drew up lists. One, probably by Hermippus, is preserved by Diogenes, but it follows a curious order, having first two alphabetical lists, of which the second probably supplements the first. These perhaps show the contents, at different times, of some great library such as the Alexandrine. They are in turn followed by a list without order, and a fourth division in the main alphabetical. The genuineness of most of the works is beyond our means of knowledge, but Usener thinks that some were rather the writings of Eudemus.[2]

Although Cicero says that Theophrastus passes over slightingly what Aristotle had treated already,[3] yet he did treat the same topics as Aristotle,[4] and probably reviewed the whole of the Aristotelian philosophy as head of the Peripatetic school. It is, therefore, almost certain that he would exactly reproduce the master's doctrine in a subject in which he was apparently less original than he was in natural sciences. Rose shows that the evidence of Cicero and Proclus proves that the dialogues of Theophrastus were written in the same manner as those of Aristotle.[5] Plutarch, whose *Consolatio*, it will be remembered, contains the passage without hiatus, perhaps taken word for word from a dialogue of Aristotle, quotes Theophrastus on Fate, and while this quotation is short, it is in precisely the same style as the Aristotelian quotation.[6] Thus it is probable that Theophrastus imitated his master as far as writing a dialogue on poetics or poets, although we are unable to tell if one of the works mentioned in the list of his writings corresponds to such a work. Fragments of Theophrastus on the question of comedy and tragedy, therefore, not found in our *Poetics*, might well have been in Aristotle's dialogue *On Poets*.

---

[1] Diogenes Laertius, *De vitis*, 5, 36, p. 294, ed. 1692.
[2] Zeller, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 352, n. 4.
[3] Cicero, *Fin.*, 1, 2, 6.
[4] Cicero, *Div.*, 2, 1, 3.
[5] Rose, *Fragm.*, p. 23.
[6] F. Wimmer, *Theophrasti Eresii opera quae supersunt omnia*, vol. iii, Leipzig, 1862, p. 181 (fragment 73).

There is, indeed, a definition of tragedy ascribed by Diomedes to Theophrastus.[1] Zeller objects to it on the ground that it is not elaborate enough,[2] an objection which Reich meets by characterizing it as a popularization of Aristotle's teaching.[3] This is possible, but the popularization does not need to have been original with Theophrastus. It was much more probably the definition in the dialogue *On Poets* that Theophrastus reproduced. It does not conflict with the conception of the nature of tragedy which underlies that of the dramatic species in the *Poetics*, and, as Margoliouth points out, Aristotle's own equivalent for the word σπουδαῖος found in *Poetics* 6 is the word *heroic* of Theophrastus' definition.[4] Von Christ, indeed, rated this latter definition higher than that of the *Poetics*, and declared it more correct on the ground that, in the definition of *Poetics* 6, the religious factor was omitted, and the discussion limited to an ethical and political treatment.

There are three other definitions of dramatic species including comedy, parallel to that of tragedy in Diomedes,[5] and critics have ascribed them all to Theophrastus.[6] If this supposition is correct, it is probable, as Reich asserts, that all four were derived from Aristotle.[7] How they came to Diomedes is uncertain, but Koett conjectures that they survived in some compendium.[8]

Although no certain proof can be offered, it is an interesting possibility that the source of Theophrastus was the dialogue *On Poets*, and it may be possible even more definitely to locate the definition of tragedy there. It has been shown by the work of Finsler that there is a close relation between the dialogue and Plato, and there is abundant evidence of his contention. Plato asserted that Empedocles was not, properly speaking, a poet, and with this Aristotle agrees both in the fragment of his dialogue *On Poets* and in the *Poetics*.

---

[1] Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, i, p. 487 of *Diomedis de oratione*, Liber iii; von Christ, *Geschichte*, i, pp. 248, 249.

[2] Zeller, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 414, n. 4.

[3] Reich, *op. cit.*, i, p. 267.

[4] Margoliouth, *Poetics*, p. 44.

[5] M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, Munich, 1904, IV. 1, p. 153.

[6] Reich, *op. cit.*, i, p. 266.

[7] *Op. cit.*, i, p. 270.

[8] E. Koett, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

Empedocles is furthermore contrasted with Homer by Plato, and by
Aristotle in the *Poetics* and *On Poets*.   Aristotle in the *Poetics* con-
nects Homer closely with the subject of tragedy, and most of his illus-
trations are chosen from the epic.   Plato, indeed, made Homer the
greatest of poets in tragedy.   Now it appears probable that Aristotle
brought Homer and Socrates together in the third book, perhaps in
showing, against Plato, that the two highest species of poetry, tragedy
and epic, possessed in a high degree the generalizing or genuinely
philosophic merit of poetry.   Thence it becomes very probable that
the fundamental idea of the nature of tragedy set forth in the *Poetics*
and concisely expressed in the Theophrastian definition, which yet
agrees with Plato and all ancient critical conceptions, would have
entered into the discussion at this point, and may have been expressed
in the very words of Theophrastus which are reproduced by Diomedes.
The Theophrastian definition would then have been found in the third
book of the dialogue *On Poets*.

CHAUCER'S LOLLIUS

By George Lyman Kittredge

CHAUCER'S LOLLIUS has long been regarded by us critics and scholars as a mystery; and, to confess the truth, the thing has become a mystery indeed under our treatment. For in our discussions we have made so many mistakes about plain matters of record, and have emitted so many discordant conjectures, that the whole subject has become entangled to the verge of distraction and is now involved in a kind of druidical mist. Let us try to extricate ourselves from the fogbound labyrinth, and to that end let us examine certain obvious phenomena — for such there are — in an orderly and logical manner, in the light of reason and common sense and of what we know of the habits of literary men.[1]

Chaucer's earliest mention of Lollius occurs in *The House of Fame* (1468). The passage is very familiar; but its bearings are often overlooked, and anyhow we must scrutinize it with care at the outset, for it is quite fundamental.

The poet is enumerating the statues erected on pillars in Fame's hall. First comes Josephus, who, with the help of seven others (unnamed) supports the burden of Hebrew history. Next stands Statius, expressly designated as the author of the *Thebaid* and the *Achilleis*. Then there is a group of six worthies who " bear up " the fame of Troy: these are Homer, Dares and Dictys,[2] Lollius, Guido delle Colonne, and Geoffrey of Monmouth. Then we have Virgil, who bears up the fame

---

[1] The purpose is to sift and review, not to invent new theories, for almost every conceivable theory has already been propounded. A reference to Miss Hammond's invaluable bibliography (*Chaucer*, 1908, pp. 94 ff.) will relieve me of the duty of ticketing the various suggestions, good and bad, with the names of their originators or adherents. For a recent discussion see Imelmann, *Englische Studien*, XLV, 406 ff.

[2] *Tytus* is probably a scribe's error for *Dytus* (i.e. Dictys). Robert Braham, who signs " The pistle to the reader " in Thomas Marshe's edition of Lydgate's Troy Book (1555), speaks of " Daretus the Phrigyan, and Dytus the Grecyan " and of " the labores aswel of Darete as Dyte."

of pious Aeneas; Ovid, who bears up the fame of the god of love; Lucan, who bears up the fame of Caesar and Pompey, and near him all those clerks who celebrate Rome — too many to call by name; then Claudian, who bears up the fame of hell, having written the *De Raptu Proserpinae*. Here Chaucer stops — for

> The halle was al ful, ywis,
> Of hem that writen olde gestes,
> As ben on trees rokes nestes,

and it would have been " a ful confus matere " to finish the catalogue.

Disregarding Lollius for the moment, we note that every single name in this enumeration represents a real person, or one of whose reality Chaucer and his contemporaries had no doubt, and that in every case the author is correctly associated with the subject. The inference is mathematically certain: *When Chaucer composed* The House of Fame *he believed that there was once a Lollius, long before his time, who had written something about the matter of Troy.* In no other way can we reasonably account for his mentioning Lollius in such a fashion and in such company — along with Homer, Dares, Dictys, Guido delle Colonne, and Geoffrey of Monmouth, precisely as he mentions Josephus as an authority on the wars of the Jews, Virgil on pious Aeneas, and Lucan on Caesar and Pompey. There is no ground for imagining that he felt any more doubt of the reality of Lollius and his work on Troy than he felt of the reality of Josephus and the *Bellum Iudaicum*, or of Virgil and the *Aeneid*, or of Statius and the epic of Thebes, or of Lucan and the *Pharsalia*. He was mistaken, no doubt, and we shall take occasion by-and-by to consider the genesis of his error. For the present, however, we are concerned merely with the isolated fact of the error itself: — Chaucer certainly believed that some Lollius or other had written something of importance about Troy. No matter how he came to think so. The causes of the opinion have nothing to do with the fact of the opinion as a part of the *res gestae* of the case. Later, when Chaucer came to write the *Troilus*, he used Lollius as a part of the fiction; but all that was at this time in the future. His mention of Lollius in *The House of Fame* is not fiction — it is a mistake pure and simple.

Now the mere name Lollius is not a blunder, and it is not an invention. Chaucer neither dreamed it nor made it up, for it is an authentic

nomen gentile borne by a score of historical Romans who have left a record behind them,[1] not to speak of the much larger number whom oblivion has overwhelmed. Chaucer found the name somewhere; he did not manufacture it. This point should never be forgotten.

Furthermore, wherever it was that Chaucer found the name Lollius, he found it, of course, in some context, not all alone by itself on a whited wall. Where the context was, we do not know, nor whether it was long or short, nor what statements it embodied, nor whether it was correctly or incorrectly read by the poet. One thing, however, we do know: to wit, that *the context in which Chaucer discovered the name Lollius conveyed to his mind the distinct impression that Lollius was the author of an important work on Troy.* In consequence of this impression he mentioned him in that capacity in *The House of Fame* along with Homer, Dares, Dictys, Guido, and Geoffrey. It is practically certain that Chaucer had never seen this Lollian work, for it is practically certain that it never existed. Nor was he acquainted with anybody who had ever seen it. Undoubtedly he supposed that it was lost beyond recovery. So much for the first stage of the Lollius question.

The next step brings us to Chaucer's *Troilus*.[2] When Chaucer came to write this novel, he wished — as all writers of fiction did, and do still — to lend his work an air of truth and authenticity. A ready and familiar device was, and still is, to appeal to some source that might be accepted as authoritative. Benoit and Boccaccio would not answer, for the conditions of the problem required an ancient (or at least an antique) personage, and preferably one who had written in a learned language. Homer was manifestly out of the question. Dares, Dictys, and Geoffrey were likewise unavailable, for their works were current, and notoriously did not contain any such story as that which Chaucer meant to tell. Guido's name might perhaps have been used at a pinch; but he also was well-known and current, and except at a pinch indeed, his dry, compendious, and unsympathetic account of the love affair could not be cited as the source of Chaucer's warm and detailed narrative. For it was not only facts that Chaucer wished to

---

[1] Von Rohden and Dessau, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, II, 295 ff.

[2] I postulate that *The House of Fame* was written before the *Troilus*. See the argument in *The Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, pp. 53–60.

ascribe to his *auctor*, but feelings, since he himself, so he tells us, is an outsider in matters of love:

> Of no sentement I this endite,
> But out of Latin in my tonge it write (ii, 13–14).

And, in fact, there was no pinch at all.   For *Lollius* was at hand, a venerable and veritable Latin name, and his vanished history, just because it had vanished, was precisely the stalking-horse that the fiction needed.   Hence, as a part of that fiction, Chaucer credited his material *en bloc* to Lollius, and professed, with a light heart, to be merely a translator from the Latin.[1]

In furtherance of his general fiction as to source, and with the same purpose of lending his work an air of truth and vividness and authenticity, Chaucer added a multitude of classical touches that are wanting in the *Filostrato*.[2]   A striking instance of this attempt to give the tale

[1] *Troilus*, ii, 14.   The *Troilus* is also called a translation in the Prologue to the *Legend* (A 250, 264, 341, 350, B 324, 370), and Chaucer speaks of it, when pleading his own cause, as reproducing "what-so myn auctour mente " (A 460, B 470). Tyrwhitt's fancy of taking *Latin* in the sense of *latino volgare*, " Italian " (note to *Parson's Tale*, §104; cf. Warton, *History of English Poetry*, addition to I, 385, in vol. II, 1778) was clever and learned, as usual, but it cannot be entertained.   For nothing can be clearer than that Chaucer intended (as part of his fiction) to have his readers understand that he was translating from *Latin*, not from some vernacular idiom.   Boccaccio, to be sure, speaks of the *Teseide* as written in " latino volgare " (in the prefatory letter) and Chaucer had doubtless read the passage, but that is no reason for imagining that Chaucer felt at liberty to use the English word *Latin* (without " vulgar ") for a modern Italian dialect (" *mio fiorentino idioma* " are Boccaccio's words in the proem to the *Filostrato*).   A word in any context means, I take it, what it is meant to mean by the writer and what it is sure to be understood to mean by the reader.   When Chaucer wrote " out of Latin in my tonge it write " he knew perfectly well that his readers would understand by " Latin " the language of Virgil and Statius, not the modern speech of Florence or Padua.   Indeed, he ensured that understanding further by his reference to " olde clerkes speche " in v, 1854–1855, shortly after his mention of " Virgile, Ovyde, Omer, Lucan, and Stace " in v, 1792.   Finally, even if Chaucer had meant " Italian " when he said " Latin," he would none the less have been resorting to a fiction, for he would have been deliberately misleading his contemporaries.

[2] Boccaccio labored to furnish the *Teseide* with appropriate mythological and other classical accoutrements, but in the *Filostrato* he is sparing of such adornments. The contrast between the two Italian poems is notable.   Cf. Crescini, *Contributo agli Studi sul Boccaccio*, pp. 246–247.   Since Chaucer was very familiar with the

an ancient — a Trojan — atmosphere is the introduction of Antigone's song of love as " a Trojan song "[1] and the conversation that follows the singing:

> " Now, nece," quod Criseyde,
> " Who made this song with so good entente ? "
> Antigone answerde anoon and seyde,
> " Ma dame, ywis, the goodlieste mayde
> Of greet estat in al the toun of Troye,
> And let her lyf in most honour and ioye."
> " Forsothe, so it semeth by her song ! "
> Quod tho Criseyde.[2]

There is not a word of this song or of the dialogue or of the whole garden scene in the *Filostrato*, and Antigone herself is a character invented by Chaucer. The Trojanizing of the situation, if I may risk the term, is Chaucer's deliberate art. It is quite of a piece with his professing to have got hold of the very words of the *Cantus Troili* (not given in full by Lollius) and to have reproduced them in as close a version as can be made in translating from the Trojan language into our vernacular.[3]

Equally felicitous and to the same end is Pandarus' quotation of the Epistle of Oenone to Paris. " I am in love myself," says Pandarus to Troilus, " and am quite helpless in my own case, but yet I can assist you in yours. Indeed, my situation is much like that described in a letter that a shepherdess, Oenone by name, wrote once to your brother Paris. You saw the letter, didn't you ? " " Why, no! " replies Troilus. " Well," says Pandarus, " this is how it went."

> " I woot wel that it fareth thus by me
> As to thy brother Parys an herdesse,
> Which that y-cleped was Oënone,
> Wrot in a compleynt of hir hevinesse:
> Ye say the lettre that she wroot, y gesse?"
> " Nay, never yet, y-wis," quod Troilus.
> " Now," quod Pandare, " herkneth; it was thus."[4]

Teseide when he wrote the *Troilus*, and used it several times in that poem, we may recognize the general influence of the *Teseide* in the passages we are now considering (cf. H. M. Cummings, *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio*, p. 67).

[1] ii, 825. [3] i, 393 ff. Cf. p. 93.
[2] ii, 877–884. [4] i, 652–658.

An extract follows, adapted from the *Heroides*.[1]   There is nothing about this letter in the *Filostrato*.   Chaucer's device in making Pandarus profess to have seen the original, in Oenone's own handwriting, is obviously akin to the device involved in his whole Lollian fiction. It is a wonder that some critic has not accused him of fraud because he did not insert a credit to Ovid.

Another detail to the same general purport is Pandarus's casual reference to the petrified Queen Niobe as one of the sights of the day:

> " For this nis not, certeyn, the nexte wyse
> To winnen love, as techen us the wyse,
> To walwe and wepe as Niobe the quene,
> *Whos teres yet in marbel been ysene.*" [2]

This, too, is of course not in the *Filostrato*.   One would know that well enough without taking heed to one's books.

We cannot pause to study all the classical touches that Chaucer has added to the story, but a few more must be merely enumerated, because of their important bearing on his design.   Thus he makes Pandarus compare the sufferings of Troilus to the agony of Tityus torn by the vultures,[3] and curse himself with a reference to Cerberus.[4] His characters swear by Minerva and Jupiter,[5] by Neptune,[6] by Mars,[7] by Venus,[8] by "natal Ioves fest,"[9] by Pallas,[10] and so on.   He describes Cressid's servants as thronging to see Troilus ride up the street from the Gate of Dardanus;[11] he puts into Pandarus' mouth directions for a love-letter that are adapted from Ovid and the *Ars Poetica;*[12] he brings a Greek spy into Troy with tidings — apparently a person who has just been captured or a knave who is playing a double game;[13] he introduces the episode of a visit to Deiphobus, full of intimate detail of the royal *ménage;*[14] he makes Cressida speak of Antenor and Aeneas

---

[1] *Troilus*, i, 659–665; *Heroides*, v, 147–154 (see p. 113, below).

[2] i, 697–700.

[3] i, 785 ff.

[4] " To Cerberus in helle ay be I bounde " (i, 859). Cf. *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel, II, 330: " Ou me lie en corde ou en fer Cerberus li portiers d'enfer."

[5] ii, 232–233.

[6] ii, 443.

[7] ii, 593.

[8] ii, 1524.

[9] iii, 150.

[10] v, 977.

[11] ii, 614–618.

[12] ii, 1023–1043.

[13] ii, 1111–1113.

[14] ii, 1394ff.

(well-known to mediaeval readers as the traitors of the cycle) as lend-
ing their support to a lawsuit about property brought against her by
false Poliphete;[1] he lets Troilus pretend to keep vigil in Apollo's
temple to see the " holy laurer quake " and to get an oracle for the
conduct of the war.[2] With similar regard for local and contemporary
color Pandarus swears " by stocks and stones " and by the gods that
dwell in heaven, and damns himself, if his speech be false, to abide as
deep in hell as Tantalus.[3] Troilus adjures Venus by her love of Adonis
whom she loved " in the shawe," and, continuing his prayer, appeals
to Jove (for love of Europa), to Mars (for love of Venus), to Phoebus
(for love of Daphne), to Mercury (for love of Herse), to Diana, and
the Fatal Sisters.[4] Again, he wishes that his night with Cressida
might be as long as Jupiter's with Alcmena[5] and chides Titan[6] for
allowing the Dawn to leave his side so early.[7] Calchas assures the
Greeks that Phoebus and Neptune are determined to bring Troy to
destruction because Laomedon refused them their hire.[8] Troilus vows
that he will love Cressida after he is dead and dwelling in torment with
Proserpine,[9] but she, more sanguine, hopes to live with him in the
Elysian Fields, like Orpheus and Eurydice.[10] She swears by all celes-
tial gods, by every nymph and infernal deity, and by the satyrs and
fauns, " that halve-goddes ben of wildernesse," and she calls upon
Atropos to break her thread if ever she prove false,[11] and declares that
Simois that runs through Troy shall turn back its current before she
will be unfaithful.[12]

All of these touches of antiquity — and enough more to make
up about a hundred — are Chaucer's own, and not taken from the
Filostrato. Their significance depends upon their number, and upon
the fact that they are in the main quite apposite. Critics, to be sure,

---

[1] ii, 1463–1475, 1616.   [3] iii, 589–593.

[2] iii, 540–546.   [4] iii, 718–735.   [5] iii, 1427–1428.

[6] On Chaucer's error in substituting Titan for Tithonus, see p. 116, below.

[7] iii, 1464–1470.   [8] iv, 120–126.

[9] iv, 470–476 (cf. *Teseide*, x, 106).

[10] iv, 785–791. " In the feld of *pitee*, out of peyne, That hight *Elysos*," looks as if
Chaucer etymologized *Elysios* with reference to (*Kyrie*) *eleison*. Cf. Ovid's " arva
piorum," *Met.*, xi, 62 (*Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXIV,
352, n. 14).

[11] iv, 1541–1547.

[12] iv, 1548–1553 (cf. *Heroides*, v, 27–31; *Roman de la Rose*, ed. Michel, II, 83).

are prone to dismiss them as mere " classical allusions," or as bits of
decoration, or even as symptoms of a desire to show off. This is futile
treatment. Nothing can be clearer than that such things *in this poem*
— whatever they may be elsewhere in the middle ages or in the
eighteenth century — are present as parts of an artistic design. They
are meant to produce or to intensify an atmosphere of high antiquity
—a Trojan or Lollian atmosphere. Chaucer pretends—in an artistic
fiction — to be translating from an ancient author, and he tries to
make his characters talk and think like persons of the heroic age in
such matters of detail as do not interfere with their truth to eternal
and unchanging humanity. He could not dig up Troy. It was out
of his power to archaeologize in dress and manners and topography.
But he could make Pandarus swear like a heathen of the heroic age,
and speak familiarly of the letter he had seen that Oenone wrote to
Paris, and refer to Niobe and her tears as still visible in stone — one
of the wonders of the world:

> " Niobe the quene,
> Whos teres yet in marbel been ysene."

And all this he did, and much more, with the same artistic purpose
that had prompted him to describe his whole poem as translated from
an ancient Latin author — one Lollius, whose long-buried work he
had been lucky enough to disinter.

Chaucer names Lollius only twice in the *Troilus*,[1] but he keeps him
constantly in the reader's memory by mentioning him as his *auctor*
and by other more or less definite references and allusions. Altogether
there are about forty such passages, or an average of one to about two
hundred verses, though they are by no means regularly apportioned.
Their effect upon the mind is uniform and cumulative, nor can there
be any doubt, in a poem so carefully finished, that this effect was de-
liberately intended. In short, Chaucer takes quite particular pains
to convey the impression that his *Troilus*, from beginning to end, is a
faithful translation from the Latin work of Lollius, without any ma-
terial additions either from other sources or from his own pen. Some-
times, to be sure, he professes or implies condensation, and now and
then he suggests that he has occasionally consulted the well-known

---

[1] i, 394; v, 1653.

authorities,[1] but these remarks are never made in such a way as to diminish the impression of thoroughgoing fidelity to Lollius. On the contrary, they strengthen that impression, for they always imply either that Lollius agrees with other authorities in the detail in question, or that the poet never departs from Lollius, even in a trifle, without due notice. Lollius, then, in Chaucer's fiction, is not Boccaccio or Benoit or Guido or Statius or Ovid or Boëthius: *he is simply Lollius*, an alleged Latin author on the Trojan War, to whom Chaucer chooses, for his artistic purposes, to credit practically everything that the *Troilus* contains — everything, that is, that Chaucer drew from Boccaccio and Benoit and Guido and Statius and Ovid and Boëthius, and likewise everything that he drew from the brain of Geoffrey Chaucer. In other words, Chaucer's pretended use of Lollius is not an acknowledgement of obligations to Boccaccio or to anybody else: it is a fiction, deliberately adopted in advance, impressed upon the reader with all the emphasis of which the poet is capable, and fostered and supported by repeated assertion and skilful innuendo.

Here we must be on our guard against taking the poet too seriously. Chaucer counted on two classes of contemporary readers: first, the gentlemen and some of the ladies of his time, who were cultivated but not scholarly; and second, a very limited group of men of learning, like Gower and Strode, the pair to whom the *Troilus* is dedicated. If the first class accepted his citation as gospel truth, and were convinced that he had unearthed a Trojan history by one Lollius in some old parchment volume, well and good! If the second class saw through

---

[1] Chaucer twice distinguishes sharply between the usual story of Troy, to be found in Homer and Dictys and Dares, and the particular Trojan story that he has in hand in the *Troilus*. One of these distinguishing passages comes very early in the poem (i, 141–147), the other is near the end (v. 1765–1771).

All the passages in which Chaucer refers or alludes to an *auctor* or a source are collected and discussed in Appendix I (pp. 92–109, below). This appendix the reader is advised to ignore if he agrees with my assertions. If he dissents, I beg him to peruse only enough of it to convince him. The chief reason for the existence of this appendix is the elaborate and ingenious argument of Dr. H. M. Cummings in Chapter viii of his substantial dissertation on *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio* (Cincinnati, 1916) — an argument which arrives at results that differ *toto caelo* from what seems to me the plain meaning of the evidence. It is only fair to add that I have found Dr. Cummings's monograph very useful in many ways.

the device and recognized Lollius as a part of the fiction, still well and good! Everybody would be content. The ladies and gentlemen would raise no question anyhow; the scholars would compliment him on the success of his poetic device. Nobody would make trouble until modern scholarship should come into existence, with its artificially stimulated craving for literary facts — and Chaucer was under no obligation to quench the thirst of modern scholarship.

Another caution seems to be necessary at this point, though one would suppose a sense of humor might have provided for it in advance. Chaucer's pretence of drawing his plot and sentiments from the Latin work of one Lollius is an artistic device, not a fraud. It has just as much and just as little to do with *veracity* as Addison's pretending to translate the Vision of Mirzah from a manuscript that he "picked up when he was at Grand Cairo," or Goldsmith's crediting *The Citizen of the World* to a Chinese sage, or Hawthorne's calling *Rappaccini's Daughter* a translation from the "Beatrice; ou la Belle Empois- soneuse" of M. de l'Aubépine, the author of "L'Artiste du Beau; ou le Papillon Mécanique" in five volumes quarto; or Mr. Maurice Hewlett's pretending to utilize, for his *Richard Yea and Nay*, a chron- icle by one "Milo, a Carthusian monk, abbot of the cloister of Saint Mary-of-the-Pine by Poictiers," who enjoyed the distinction of be- ing "the life-long friend" of King Richard himself — a real person, by the way, whose account of the "acta" of Richard I exists no longer.[1] I cannot refrain from quoting a recent critic of Mr. Hewlett, merely to show how different is the spirit in which we judge our con- temporary romancers and their clever tricks, from the stodgy mixture of naïve literalness and moral fervor that dominates us when we ap- praise Chaucer. "It is from the writings of this priest," says Mr. Milton Bonner, "that Mr. Hewlett pretends to draw justification for his inventions. The extracts from Milo's supposititious history lend just the air of verity that we needed to help overcome scruples when confronted by certain aspects of the story."[2]

Here, perhaps, is the place to compare Chaucer's artistic device in the *Troilus* with his procedure in several of the *Canterbury Tales*.

[1] See Stubbs, *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I*, I, xxxiii– xxxiv.

[2] *Maurice Hewlett*, Boston, 1910, p. 81.

The Miller's Tale and the *Reeve's* are fabliaux worked up, doubt-less, from the French; yet Chaucer makes the Miller localize the story at Oxford,[1] and the Reeve lays the scene of the adventure with which he replies to the Miller, at Trumpington, near Cambridge, where there is a brook with a bridge and a mill, emphasizing his story as " verray sooth."[2] *The Cook's Tale* is " a litel iape that fil in our citee " of London.[3] *The Friar's Tale*, in like manner, is of persons well-known " in my contree,"[4] and his opponent the Sumner is earnest enough in denouncing it as a lie.[5] Yet he localizes his own anecdote in a marshy district called Holderness in Yorkshire.[6] Even the Nun's Priest follows the fashion, though with a deliciously ironical innu-endo:

> " This storie is also trewe, I undertake,
> As is the book of Launcelot de Lake,
> That wommen holde in ful great reverence."[7]

Particularly enlightening with regard to Chaucer's methods as a writer of fiction are the words of the Man of Law in praise of mer-chants. " Ye are the fathers of tidings," says the lawyer, " and of tales, both those of peace and those of strife !

> " I were right now of tales desolat,
> Nere that a marchaunt, goon is many a yere,
> Me taughte a tale, which that ye shal here."[8]

Then follows the story of Constance, which is taken for the most part from Nicholas Trivet's chronicle, though Trivet might never have walked the earth for anything that Chaucer says about him.

Nowhere, in short, does Chaucer, in his capacity of writer of fiction, recognize any obligation whatever to cite the actual source of his material, or scruple to lend an air of truth and reality to his stories by including express statements as to source or scene that bear no rela-tion whatever to the facts. We have as much, and as little, reason to be surprised at his ascription of the *Troilus* to somebody different from Boccaccio as to be surprised at his pretending to have dreamed *The*

---

[1] A 3187. On these localizing touches cf. Tatlock, *The Scene of the Franklin's Tale Visited*, p. 70, note 1.

[2] A 3921–3924.

[3] A 4343.

[4] D 1299.

[5] D 1670.

[6] D 1709–1712.

[7] B 4401–4403.

[8] B 129–133.

Book of the Duchess and the *House of Fame*. In the latter case, we recall, he mentions the very month and day on which he had the vision![1]

Let us next consider the attitude of Chaucer's immediate circle toward his ascription of the Troilus material to Lollius. The poem is dedicated to John Gower and Ralph Strode. Did these scholarly persons accept this ascription as a matter of fact? Of course not. Strode was a professional philosopher, and must instantly have recognized the complaint of Cressida[2] and the song of Troilus[3] in the Third Book and the long soliloquy of Troilus in Book Fourth,[4] as founded on Boëthius. This information, indeed, was within the reach of any Englishman who had access to a copy of Chaucer's own version, if, as is altogether likely, this had been published before the *Troilus* came out. Gower, for his part, might be trusted to detect the borrowings from Ovid, whose works he knew almost by heart. In particular, he could not miss the quotation in Book i[5] from Oenone's epistle in the *Heroides*,[6] which Chaucer himself had sufficiently labelled for any half-educated reader by making Pandarus introduce it as an extract from " the letter that she wrote."[7] Neither Gower nor Strode could fail to perceive that Cassandra's account of the Theban contest[8] was drawn from Statius, even if Chaucer himself is not responsible for the insertion of the twelve lines of Latin that give the argument of the twelve books of the *Thebaid*.[9] As for the story of Troilus in general, it was perfectly familiar to Gower in one of his favorite volumes, the *Roman de Troie*,[10] and he could scarcely have overlooked all of the numerous passages for which Chaucer is indebted to Benoit.[11]

This accumulation of " details tending to prove " may seem absurd in so plain a case, but the reader will pardon it if he recollects the in-

---

[1] *House of Fame*, 63.

[2] iii, 813–836; Boëthius, ii, prose 4.

[3] iii, 1744–1771; Boëthius, ii, metre 8.

[4] iv, 958–1078; Boëthius, v, pr. 2 and 3.

[5] i, 659–665 (cf. p. 113, below).

[6] v, 147–154.　　　　　　　　　　　[8] v, 1485–1510.

[7] i, 656.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[9] After v, 1498.

[10] See Kittredge, *Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, pp. 4–7.

[11] See Young, *Origin and Development of the Story of Troilus and Criseyde*, pp. 105 ff.

clination of scholars to judge the middle ages as a time apart, when nobody thought or felt or acted as men do now-a-days. There was, we are told, a childlike faith in authority — the written word was always accepted at its face value. Perhaps so — though I doubt it vehemently — but that has nothing to do with what passed between man and man in the give-and-take of ordinary life. Gower and Strode might have accepted a citation of Lollius as a sober acknowledgment of genuine indebtedness if they had seen it in Vincent of Beauvais or John of Salisbury; but they knew the difference between an encyclopaedist or a philosopher and a romancing poet, and they knew Geoffrey Chaucer in his habit as he lived. How many of his readers Mr. Hewlett took in with his Abbot Milo, who shall tell? Not many, I fancy, among the better educated; none at all, I am sure, among his personal friends. Nor did Mr. Hewlett desire to take anybody in. He simply wished to heighten the verisimilitude of his romance by means of an ancient and well-accredited device.

But let us return to Strode and Gower. Can there be the slightest doubt that Chaucer told these intimate friends of his all he knew about the *Filostrato* months before he began to work at his own adaptation, or that, as time went on, he read parts of the *Troilus* to them and talked over his plans with regard to the work, including the felicitous idea of ascribing it to one Lollius? At the outset we purposed to examine such probabilities in the light not only of reason and common sense but also of the habits of literary men. Are we to assume that Chaucer never discussed his poems while he was writing them?

Chaucer's immediate circle, then, knew well enough, when the *Troilus* appeared, that he had drawn much of his material from an Italian poet, and none of it from Lollius. He made no secret of the matter; indeed, he could not have mystified them if he had wished. Nor is there any likelihood that he swore them to secrecy when he took them into his confidence. He was composing a romantic novel, not forging a will. And, beyond any reasonable question, the fact that the *Troilus* came largely from an Italian poem was soon a matter of common knowledge, with Chaucer's hearty consent, among all such persons as took an interest in him and his works.

For this last proposition, however, we need not depend upon general probabilities. There is a distinct piece of positive evidence that

establishes it beyond a peradventure. I refer to a notorious passage
in Lydgate, which has been stretched upon the rack a score of times
to elicit confessions of things that it could not confess, but has never,
I think, been interrogated with regard to the single point on which it
is really competent to testify and quite ready to speak without com-
pulsion.

> In youth he made a translacion
> Of a booke which called is Trophe
> In Lumbard tong, as men may reade and see,
> And in our vulgare, long or that he deyed,
> Gaue it the name of Troylous and Cresseyde.[1]

Lydgate is a muddled witness, as usual. Still, the difficulties in the
present case are by no means staggering. " In his youth " is too early,
but Lydgate knew nothing about the minutiae of Chaucerian chronol-
ogy, and the question of dates does not here concern us. " Trophe "
is a manifest blunder. There is no chance whatever that the *Filostrato*,
or anything else that Chaucer used in the *Troilus*, was ever called by
any such name. The blunder is due to mere confusion of memory.
Lydgate had read *The Monk's Tale*, where Chaucer cites " Trophe "
as an authority on the Pillars of Hercules,[2] and he shifted the appli-
cation in a moment of paramnesia. Chaucer's " Trophee " may be
a mystery,[3] but Lydgate's is not. It has no foundation or genesis save
in this passage of *The Monk's Tale*, misapplied by a constitutional
blunderer, and it need trouble us no more.

What remains, then, of our quotation from Lydgate? Simply
this: the statement that Chaucer translated his *Troilus* from a book
" in Lombard tongue " — that is, in Italian. In other words, good
Dan John, about a generation after Chaucer's death, was well aware
that the source of the *Troilus* was not a Latin book by Lollius, but a
book in the Italian language. How did Lydgate know? Why, from
the common talk of literary men, passed down by immediate tradition

---

[1] *Falls of Princes*, Prologue (ed. 1554, Tottell, sig. A. ii v°; ed. 1558, Wayland,
sig. A. ii v°).

[2] B 3307.

[3] For some recent conjectures see my essay on *The Pillars of Hercules and Chau-
cer's " Trophee*," in the *Putnam Anniversary Volume*, 1909, pp. 545 ff.; Tupper,
Modern Language Notes, XXXI, 11; Emerson, in the same, XXXI, 142.

from the contemporaries of Chaucer himself.[1] In other words, there had never been any secret about the derivation of the *Troilus* from the *Filostrato*. Chaucer's citation of Lollius was not deceit, but transparent literary artifice. Anybody who asked the facts was at liberty to learn them. They were matters of general knowledge among Chaucer's friends and the court circle in general.

Much dust has been raised over Chaucer's neglect or omission to mention the name of Boccaccio anywhere. Let us examine the matter. The places in which moderns look in vain for some reference to Boccaccio are the *Troilus, The Knight's Tale, Anelida and Arcite, The Monk's Tale*, and *The Clerk's Tale*.[2]

The *Troilus* we have already considered, and to it we shall later return. What has there been said applies in general (except so far as Lollius is concerned) to *The Knight's Tale*. I can see no reason why Chaucer should have mentioned, or made the knight mention, the direct source of the story, any more than in the case of the other *Canterbury Tales*. For almost every one of these Chaucer had a source; but he has seldom mentioned it. In several instances the teller of the story insists on its truth and undertakes to localize it in England. In no one of all these cases has anybody expressed amazement at Chaucer's fiction in localizing, which is, of course, precisely similar to that of giving your story (if it deals with ancient times) an air of antiquity

---

[1] We should observe that Lydgate does not connect Lollius with " Trophee " or assert that Chaucer took the *Troilus* from Lollius. On the contrary, his assertion that Chaucer translated from the Italian records a piece of information which amounts to an express denial that Chaucer's source was a Latin writer — whether Lollius or anybody else. When Lydgate mentions Lollius, as he does (once) in the *Troy Book*, he refers to him not as an author used by Chaucer anywhere, but simply as a person who wrote about the siege of Troy. " And of this sege wrot eke Lollius " (ed. Bergen. *Prol.*, 309). This information Lydgate doubtless got from *The House of Fame*. He did not accept the statement of Chaucer that he translated the *Troilus* from Lollius' Latin, for he had better information; but he did accept the statement that there once was a Lollius who composed a work on the Trojan history.

[2] Nobody, I believe, expresses amazement at Chaucer's failure to mention Boccaccio in *The Parliament of Fowls* or the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*. As to *The Franklin's Tale*, if the source was really Boccaccio (a question not here in place to debate), one has but to compare the stories to see that Chaucer must have had a pedant's conscience if he had felt obliged to refer to Boccaccio for a performance that was so marvellously his own. And what, in turn, was Boccaccio's source, and why did not *he* refer to it ?

by suppressing the name of your actual modern authority and referring
either to some definite Lollius (as in *Troilus*) or in general to the " old
stories" or "old books,"[1] which is what the knight does :

> As olde bokes seyn
> That al this storie tellen more pleyn.[2]

Once, indeed, he adds Statius to the other old books:

> As men may biholde
> In Stace of Thebes, and thise bokes olde (2293–2294).[3]

The particular thing is in the *Teseide*, vii, 72, not in Statius.[3] Note
that there is absolutely no claim to originality. Throughout the poem,
the knight protests, again and again, that he is condensing a tale that
he has read.[4] For my part, I can see no reason in literary morals for
mentioning Boccaccio, and I cannot fail to see abundant reason, in
good art, for doing exactly what Chaucer has done. If it be objected
that *The Knight's Tale* is a big thing, and that therefore Chaucer was
under more pressing obligation to mention his source than in the case
of the anonymous fabliaux, I will take refuge in the *Melibee*, where
also the author is not mentioned, and there is likewise no pretence of
originality. Surely, the most mathematically minded of moderns can
grasp the general fact that, when a mediaeval writer professed to be
following some *auctor* or other, thus declining all merit of originality,
he was under no sort of obligation to specify who that *auctor* really
was. Chaucer, at all events, acknowledged no such obligation. His
practice was to do so only when to refer to the source would add to
the authority or verisimilitude. In *The Knight's Tale*, a reference to

---

[1] A 859, 1198, 1463, 2155.   [2] A 1463–1464.

[3] Dr. Wise makes an ingenious defence of what he calls Chaucer's " good faith "
in this reference. By "hir thinges," he says, "Chaucer probably means such
sacrificial rites as Boccaccio describes, *Tes.* vii. 75," and he goes on to show that
similar rites *are* described (though not credited to Emilia, of course) in the *Thebaid*
(*The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer*, pp. 98–100). Very likely Chaucer had
this fact in mind, but that does not change the other fact, — namely, that he de-
liberately undertakes, both here and elsewhere, to produce the impression that he
is following an ancient author in telling the story of Palamon and Arcite.

[4] A 875–892, 985, 994–1000, 1187–1190, 1201, 1341, 1358, 1377–1380, 1417, 1461,
1463–1464, 1480, 1782, 1895, 1935, 1953–1954, 2039–2040, 2052, 2073–2074, 2197–
2208, 2263–2264, 2284–2288, 2820–2821, 2919–2966.

Boccaccio's *Teseide* would, on the contrary, have decreased this effect. It would have been inartistic pedantry. Let it here be remembered that in the one Canterbury Tale which Chaucer invented (*Sir Thopas*) he fictiously declines to pass as the author. It is the only story he knows — " a rym I lerned longe agoon,"[1] and " the beste rym I can." [2]

That Chaucer did not mention Boccaccio in connection with the *Anelida* would never have attracted a moment's attention, were it not that scholars were busied in rolling up a cumulative case. We shall return to this fragment presently.

In *The Clerk's Tale*, that scholar refers in the most definite and particular way to Petrarch. The reference completely covers the borrowing. There was no call to give the earlier history of the document anyhow, whether Chaucer knew it (from Petrarch's preliminary letter) or not. That a definite and correct source is here referred to is a part of the drama. This is exactly what one would expect the Clerk, a scholar, to do, and it was certainly in keeping with the situation for him to refer to a clerk who praised a woman, for he was answering the Wife of Bath, who had declared that such a case had never been heard of. Here to refer to the exact source, then, was as artistic on Chaucer's part as *not* to refer to it in the other cases. However, the point we are discussing — why does Chaucer never refer to Boccaccio by name? — is neither advanced nor retarded by this instance. It is answer enough to say: He does not refer to Boccaccio because he got the tale from Petrarch. The fiction here — for there is almost always a fiction — consists in the Clerk's assertion that Petrarch *told* him the story in person at Padua.

And so we come to *The Monk's Tale* — where, and where alone, there is a real puzzle. For here, in the account of Zenobia, which comes from Boccaccio's *De Claris Mulieribus*, the Monk refers to " my maister Petrak." Why, I do not know, — perhaps because Chaucer thought him a more appropriate author than Boccaccio for the decorous and stately Monk to cite. That, at all events, would be reason enough. As to lapse of memory, or confusion — that, too would certainly have been easy. Almost all the Zenobia comes from Boccaccio's treatise *De Claris Mulieribus*, — only a bit from the *De Casibus*—and

---

[1] B 1898–1899.   [2] B 2118.

what more likely than that Chaucer should have confused this in his
memory with Petrarch's work with a similar title, *De Viris Illustribus?*
Petrarch does speak of Zenobia in the *Trionfo della Fama* (ii, 107–117,
ed. Appel, p. 255); but I see no reason to believe that Chaucer was
acquainted with that poem.

   Since we are on the subject of " Boccaccio and obligations," may
it not be enlightening to observe how Boccaccio himself proceeded in
the matter of acknowledging indebtedness ? First, the *Teseide*. In
the dedicatory letter to la Fiammetta, Boccaccio asserts that he came
across a very ancient history, unknown to most people,[1] and this he
has turned into Italian rhyme. In the second stanza of the poem
itself he repeats this statement, declaring that he is about to write in
rhyme an ancient history, so buried and hidden in years that no
Latin author says anything about it, to the best of his knowledge and
belief:

> E' m'è venuta voglia con pietosa
> Rima di scriver una storia antica,
> Tanto negli anni riposta e nascosa,
> Che latino autor non par ne dica,
> Per quel ch' i' senta, in libro alcuna cosa.[2]

A very large part of the *Teseide* is borrowed from the *Thebaid*.[3] Yet
Statius is nowhere cited, for it is Boccaccio's deliberate intention to
refer his epic to a source known only to himself, — to a lost author
whom he has had the luck to discover. Now when Chaucer wrote
the *Troilus*, he was well acquainted with both the *Thebaid* and the
Teseide.[4] Of course, then, he saw whence the Italian poet had derived
a large part of his material, never scrupling to translate literally. Nor
could he fail to appreciate the wisdom and artistic justification of
Boccaccio's pretence about the lost author so happily discovered by
him. Here let it be noted that Chaucer's debt to Boccaccio in the
Troilus is for almost exactly one third of his poem — precisely the

---

[1] " Trovata una antichissima storia, e al più delle genti non manifesta " (p. 3).

[2] This passage makes the question whether Chaucer knew the dedicatory letter
to la Fiammetta a matter of indifference in our discussion. Cf. *Teseide*, xii, 84–85.
Note also "Sì gli nasconde in sè la lunga etade," vi, 64 (*Aeneid*, v, 302), and in
particular "se il ver l'antichità ragiona," xii, 53, where the poet is describing Emilia.

[3] See pp. 121 ff., below for details.

[4] On Chaucer's use of the *Teseide* in the *Troilus*, see pp. 110 ff., below.

amount of Boccaccio's debt to Statius in the *Teseide*. It's a poor rule that won't work both ways: yet I have heard nobody express surprise at Boccaccio's silence about his debt to Statius.

When we examine the *Filostrato*, we observe a state of things no less interesting and significant. Boccaccio assures his lady in the *Proemio* that he found it impossible to conceal his feelings of love and sorrow without dying. He determined, therefore, to relieve them by utterance, and, by a kind of divine inspiration, he hit upon the idea of relating them in song in the character of some lover whose sufferings resembled his own. "Meco adunque con sollecita cura cominciai a rivolgere l'antiche storie, per trovare cui potesse verisimilmente fare scudo del mio segreto e amoroso dolore." No personage that was better adapted to this purpose occurred to him than "il valoroso giovane Troilo," son of the noble Priam, king of Troy; for the life of Troilus, in that it was sorrowful on account of love and the absence of Criseida, " se fede alcuna alle antiche storie si può dare," was very similar to Boccaccio's own after the departure of his lady. Therefore he composed the *Filostrato*. " When you find Troilus," he adds, " lamenting the departure of Criseida, you will be able to comprehend my words, my tears, my sighs, and my anguish; when he praises Criseida you may understand that I am praising you. The other matters, however, concerning his previous felicity, have no reference to me. I have inserted them because they are found in the history of that noble lover." [1]

The Italian poet, then, here as in the *Teseide*, professes to have drawn his material from some ancient author, to whose work he refers as *la storia* more than once in the course of the poem.[2] As a matter of fact, he derived the story of Troilus and Cressida from the *Roman de Troie* of Benoit de Sainte Maure, and utilized Guido delle Colonne to some extent;[3] but neither of these writers did he deign to mention, wisely and artistically preferring to lend his poem the authority of

---

[1] L'altre cose [besides the laments and the praises of the lady], che oltre a queste vi sono assai, niuna, siccome già dissi, a me non appartiene, nè per me vi si pone, ma perchè la storia nel nobile innamorato giovane lo richiede (p. 9).

[2] See i, 16, 46; iii, 90; cf. i, 48.

[3] See Young, *The Origin and Development of the Story of Troilus and Criseyde*, 1908, for details.

an unnamed ancient. Like Chaucer, Boccaccio credits to this ancient not only all that he has borrowed from anybody, but also all that he has invented himself.

Now Chaucer was just as familiar with Benoit as Boccaccio was; [1] and, as in the case of the *Teseide* he had noted the Italian's unacknowledged debt to Statius, so in the case of the *Filostrato* he noted his unacknowledged debt to Benoit.[2] This debt, he saw, was substantial; yet Boccaccio had not only ignored it but had taken pains to divert attention from Benoit by insisting on a very " ancient " source. Further, Chaucer observed (no doubt with pleasure) that in the *Teseide* Boccaccio had appealed to a history so old as not to be mentioned by the [known and extant] Latin writers — that is, to a lost document which the Italian poet had had the good fortune to find.

Chaucer was an apt pupil, and he took all the hints. He suppressed the name of Boccaccio in the *Troilus* as Boccaccio had suppressed the name of Benoit in the *Filostrato*, and he ascribed his poem to an ancient Latin writer. Further, he improved upon the fiction that his master had used in the *Teseide*. He actually knew (so he thought) the name of an ancient who had written a lost work on the Trojan War — one Lollius — and so he not only pretended to have found a manuscript known to few or none of his contemporaries, but gave the very name of the author whom he professed to follow.

That Chaucer did in very truth get the suggestion for the Lollian fiction (except for the name) from Boccaccio in the manner just indicated, and from the Italian passages just referred to, is fortunately not a matter of conjecture or even of mere inference. For we may be quite certain that he read with care both the *Proemio* to the *Filostrato* and the second stanza of the *Teseide*. As to the *Proemio*, his eager disclaimer of personal knowledge of a lover's feelings, his profession of being an outsider in such matters,[3] is a clear and deliberate reversal

---

[1] See *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXIV, 344 ff.

[2] It may no doubt be alleged that Boccaccio's indebtedness to Benoit in the *Filostrato* is not so large *in bulk* as Chaucer's indebtedness to Boccaccio in the *Troilus;* but that does not signify. Boccaccio's debt to Benoit was substantial — without Benoit there would have been no *Filostrato*. Yet Boccaccio not only ignores Benoit, but takes pains to divert attention from him by insisting on an " ancient " source.

[3] *Troilus*, ii, 8–21.

of the situation of Boccaccio as there described.[1]   As to the second
stanza of the *Teseide*, the evidence is still more striking, for Chaucer,
before he composed either the *Palamon* or the *Troilus*, had actually
utilized that stanza as the second stanza of his unfinished *Anelida and
Arcite*.

> E' m' è venuta voglia con pietosa
> Rima di scriver una storia antica,
> Tanto negli anni riposta e nascosa,
> Che latino autor non par ne dica,
> Per quel ch' i' senta, in libro alcuna cosa.[2]

> For it ful depe is sonken in my minde
> With pitous herte in English for tendyte
> This olde storie, in Latin which I finde,
> Of quene Anelida and fals Arcita,
> That elde, which that al can frete and byte,
> As it hath freten many a noble storie,
> Hath nigh devoured out of our memorie.[3]

The indebtedness of the introductory stanzas of *Anelida* to the
introductory stanzas of the *Teseide* was noted years ago by ten Brink;[4]
but the bearing of the situation on the Lollian fiction in the *Troilus*

---

[1] If this does not suffice, we may clinch the matter by comparing *Troilus*, v,
666–679, with *Filostrato*, v, 70, and with a passage in the *Proemio*.   Stanza 70 gave
Chaucer a part of his lines, but 671–672 are straight from the *Proemio:*

> And thennes comth this eyr, that is so swote
> That in my soule I fele it doth me bote.

"Quindi ogni *aura*, ogni *soave vento che di colà viene*, così nel viso ricevo, quasi il
vostro senza niuno fallo abbia tocco: nè è perciò troppo lungo *questo mitigamento*"
(p. 4).

[2] *Teseide*, i, 2.   Cf. the preliminary letter to la Fiammetta: — " Trovata una
antichissima storia, e al più delle genti non manifesta " (p. 3).

[3] *Anelida*, st. 2.   The first ten stanzas of the *Anelida* have their sources as fol-
lows: — 1–3 in *Teseide*, i, 1–3 (in reverse order, 3, 2, 1); 4–7 in *Thebaid*, xii, 519–
535, with a touch from *Teseide*, ii, 22, in stanza 6; 8–10 in *Teseide*, ii, 10–12.   With
stanza 11 Chaucer begins to be original and he so continues.   At the end of the
fragment he is about to describe the temple of Mars, and here, of course, imita-
tion of Statius or of the *Teseide* (or of both) would have come in again.   But the
story in general was certainly to be from neither Statius nor Boccaccio, nor, indeed,
from any work that scholars have been able to name or even to guess at.   Skeat has
well noted the resemblance to the story of the falcon in *The Squire's Tale* (*Oxford
Chaucer*, I, 534).

[4] *Chaucer, Studien*, 1870, pp. 49–53.

hardly seems to have been perceived. Chaucer's procedure in the two poems is practically the same. In the *Anelida* he adopts from the *Teseide* Boccaccio's fiction of having discovered a lost or forgotten piece of ancient history, and expressly declares that he is about to translate it from the Latin.[1] In the *Troilus*, as we have seen, he adopts the very same fiction, improving upon it by actually naming the Latin writer — one Lollius — whom he pretends to translate faithfully.[2]

[1] A reminiscence of Boccaccio's fiction in the *Teseide* as to a source very ancient and therefore little known — an echo, indeed, of his very words — occurs also in the defence of Chaucer by Alcestis in the *Legend:*

> He made the book that hight the Hous of Fame,
> And ek the Deeth of Blaunche the Duchesse,
> And the Parlement of Foules, as I gesse,
> And al the love of Palamon and Arcite, —
> Of Thebes, thogh the storie is knowen lyte, —
> And many an ympne for your holydayes (A 405–410, B 417–422).

That is, " Chaucer wrote all the love of Palamoun and Arcite " and then, parenthetically, " they were of Thebes, although (unlike the tale of Cadmus and Oedipus and Eteocles and Polynices — the regular Theban cycle) their particular history is not included in the ordinary accounts of Thebes, and is therefore comparatively little known." It is, as Boccaccio has said, " al più delle genti non manifesta," " negli anni riposta e nascosa." In saying that " the *story* is little known," Chaucer is not speaking of his own special version, but of the *story itself*, i.e. the *history, the old tale*. This interpretation (which accords with the regular meaning of *story* in Chaucer, and which completely justifies the *though*) is, in the main, that of ten Brink and Skeat. It removes the passage from its consecrated position as an indication of chronology, for what Alcestis says is, in effect, " He has told the little-known history of Palamon and Arcite," not " He has told the history of Palamon and Arcite, but his poem has attracted slight attention." Thus we are left free to put the *Palamon* where it belongs, before the *Troilus* (see p. 69, note).

[2] Cf. *Anelida* (as just quoted) with *Troilus*, ii, 13–14: "Of no sentement I this endyte, But out of Latin in [= into] my tonge it write." Note also that the *Troilus* is called a translation in *The Legend of Good Women*, A 350 (B 370), cf. A 250 (B 324).

I think the parallel may be carried still farther. In the *Anelida*, after declaring that he is to translate from the Latin an old and almost forgotten story, Chaucer concludes his proem with the avowal, "First follow I Stace, and after him Corinne" (21). In fact he follows Statius (and the *Teseide*) for the next seven stanzas (4–10) and then begins to invent. At stanza 11, then, we are to suppose that he begins his pretended translation from Corinne — a Theban story. The most natural inference is that Chaucer somehow got hold of the name of Corinna and found her described as a famous Theban poetess, and that he accordingly utilized her name as he utilized that of Lollius in the *Troilus*. Where he found the so-called Theban Corinna mentioned, we do not know, any more than we know where he found the name

Since he really believed (as *The House of Fame* shows) that there had once existed a work on Troy by this Lollius, the alleged use of him in the *Troilus* involves the pretence that he had discovered the long-lost document.

What Chaucer was about in ascribing the *Troilus* as a whole to Lollius — the real *ad hoc* of his artistic device — may be further illustrated, on a smaller scale, by a curious passage in the poem itself. In the Fourth Book, when Pandarus is trying to cheer up his disconsolate friend, he cites a certain Zanzis or Zauzis:

> And eek, as writ Zanzis, that was ful wys,
> " The newe love out chaceth ofte tholde,"
> And upon newe cas lyth newe avys.
> Thenk eek thyself to saven artow holde.
> Swich fyr by proces shal of kinde colde;
> For syn it is but casuel plesaunce,
> Som cas shal putte it out of remembraunce;
>
> For al-so seur as day cometh after night,
> The newe loue, labour, or other wo,
> Or elles selde seeing of a wight,
> Don olde affecciouns alle ouer-go;
> And, for thy part, thou shalt have oon of tho
> Tabrigge with thy bittre peynes smerte:
> Absence of hir shal dryue hir out of herte (iv, 414–427).

For all this, the *Filostrato* has merely (iv, 49, 1–4)

> E come io udii già sovente dire,
> Il nuovo amor sempre caccia l'antico;
> Nuovo piacere il presente martire
> Torrà da te.

Ballenus and various other pieces of curious lore (see p. 74, below). It is certain enough that the *Anelida* preceded the *Palamon* (see Tatlock, *Development and Chronology*, pp. 83–86, where previous studies of Mather and others are cited). Whether the *Troilus* or the *Anelida* was written first, makes little or no difference in our discussion, and the point may be waived. For my own part, I agree with Lowes in the order *Anelida, Palamon, Troilus* (*Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XX, 861). At all events, the *Anelida* and the *Troilus* cannot be far apart in date, and the fiction of a lost or hitherto unknown Latin source in the *Anelida* throws a strong light on Chaucer's intention in citing Lollius as his Latin *auctor* in the *Troilus*. I may add that the parallel still holds good if *Corinne* be interpreted as *Corinnus* (Skeat) or as *Ovid* (Shannon, *Publications*, as above, XXVII, 461 ff.), since on either of those two hypotheses the poet would still be pretending to follow *for his narrative a* lost document which he had discovered.

The saying, though of course Boccaccio does not let Pandaro say so, is from the *Remedia Amoris*, being equally similar to " Successore novo vincitur omnis amor " (462) and to " Et posita est cura cura repulsa nova" (484). Naturally Chaucer recognized it, for the former verse introduces the famous passage about Chryseis and the latter concludes it.[1] His mind, therefore, went back to the *Remedia*, and he expanded Pandarus's speech by adding certain other cures for love that are mentioned by Ovid, — occupation (see *R. A.*, 135–210, especially 139–144, 149–150, 205–206) and absence (*R. A.*, 214–239).[2] Yet he chose to ascribe "The newe love out-chacheth ofte the olde" to some old sage, Zanzis[3] or Zauzis, whom an ancient like Pandarus might be supposed to quote. Here we have a device which, in miniature, is absolutely identical with the ascription of the whole poem to an ancient Latin worthy, one Lollius, an authority on Troy and the Trojans.

[1] *R. A.*, 462–484 (cf. Kittredge, *The Date of Chaucer's Troilus*, pp. 17 ff.; Wilkins, *Boccaccio Studies*, pp. 54–59.

[2] In this expansion he follows in part Troilo's words to Pandaro as given by Boccaccio a few stanzas later (iv. 59, overlooked by Rossetti, p. 186, and by Cummings, p. 72):

<div align="center">

Credimi Pandar, credimi che amore
Quando s'apprende per sommo piacere
Nell' animo d'alcun, cacciarnel fuore
Non si può mai, ma puonne ben cadere
In processo di tempo, se dolore,
O morte, o povertà, *o non vedere*
La cosa amata non gli son cagione,
Com' egli avvenne già a più persone.

Swich fyr *by proces* shal of kynde colde.
.   .   .   .   .   .

For also seur as day cometh after night,
The newe love, labour, *or other wo,*
Or elles selde seinge of a wight,
Don olde affeciouns alle ouer-go (iv, 418, 421–424).

</div>

" Labour," not in Boccaccio, is directly from Ovid.

[3] *Zanzis* is thought to be *Zeuxis*. One wonders whether Chaucer had happened to hear of the wise and prudent person of that name who figures in the Alexander story. This Zeuxis makes his appearance in the first book of Julius Valerius. The author takes pains to assure us that this is not the famous painter (see *The Physician's Tale*, C 16), but one of Philip's courtiers. He had charge of the young Alexander's expenditures and wrote to inform Philip and Olympias that the prince was wasting his allowance in lavish giving (i, 16, Kuebler, pp. 17–18).

Little did Chaucer imagine, when in the *Troilus* he adopted and improved Boccaccio's fiction of a lost *auctor*, that future generations would pull long faces as they solemnly debated his ingratitude in neglecting to specify his extensive obligations to the Italian poet. When he and Boccaccio first met "in the feld of pitee, out of peyne, that hight Elysos," it is unlikely that Boccaccio thought of reproving him. If, however, Boccaccio was so lacking in humor, and in appreciation of an author's rights, no doubt Chaucer replied by quoting Shakspere (with the same anachronism by which Shakspere made Hector quote Aristotle): "The villany you teach me I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction."

So far we have proceeded, I think, by a sober and pedestrian method, following known facts step by step. We have resorted to no conjectures, but have candidly interpreted the obvious phenomena (as we purposed to do) in the light of reason and common sense and of the established customs of literary men in past and present. Let us sum up the results in the form of definite propositions.

1. The mere name *Lollius* is not a blunder or an invention; for it is a genuine Roman *nomen gentile*.

2. Chaucer found the name somewhere in the course of his reading, and, of course, it was in some context that he found it, not all alone by itself.

3. The context in which Chaucer found the name was such as to teach him (erroneously) that one Lollius wrote a book on the Trojan War.

4. Accordingly, in *The House of Fame*, Chaucer included Lollius in a list of authorities on the matter of Troy — along with Homer, Dictys, Dares, Guido delle Colonne, and Geoffrey of Monmouth.

5. In thus mentioning Lollius in *The House of Fame* Chaucer was not inventing: he was under a misapprehension. He believed that a work by Lollius on the Trojan War had once existed, but, since neither he nor any of his acquaintances had ever seen it, that it was lost.

6. When Chaucer wrote the *Troilus*, his erroneous belief that one Lollius had written a (lost) work on Troy had not been corrected.

7. Accordingly, in the *Troilus*, as a part of the fiction, Chaucer pretended to be translating faithfully the Latin work of Lollius. This

Lollius is not Boccaccio, nor Petrarch, nor Benoit, nor Guido: he is purely and simply Lollius — a supposed ancient writer on the subject, whose work Chaucer pretended to have before him. The fiction consists not in ascribing to Lollius a work on Troy (for that was merely an error) but in claiming to have this work in hand and to translate it faithfully.

8. Chaucer's fiction of pretending to follow Lollius in the *Troilus* was imitated and improved by him from Boccaccio's similar fiction in the *Teseide* and the *Filostrato*. The improvement consists in ascribing the work to a definitely named source instead of " an ancient history " or " a lost author recently discovered by me in turning over ancient books." In using the name of Lollius, Chaucer was citing an *auctor* in whose existence as a writer on Troy he fully believed, but whose book he thought had disappeared.

9. Chaucer, in accordance with the habits of his time, acknowledged no obligation to mention the actual sources from which he drew the material for his fictions. He felt quite at liberty to invent sources, or to give credit to authors different from those to whom he was actually indebted. In the practice of such devices, for artistic effect, for verisimilitude, or for lending dignity to his subject, he had Boccaccio himself as a distinguished exemplar. There is no moral question involved. The trick justifies itself if it is well worked. If both Chaucer and Boccaccio went farther in this way than a scrupulous modern would feel warranted in going, they had two valid defences, — first, the custom of mediaeval writers, and second, their general avowal of indebtedness to somebody, or, in other words, their disclaimer of originality.

10. Both Gower and Strode must have been aware that Chaucer derived the story of *Troilus* in large part from an Italian poem. The fiction of a reference to Lollius in the *Troilus* was known to some of Chaucer's contemporaries as a fiction, and hence to Lydgate a generation or so later. In other words, it was not a dark secret, carefully locked in the breast of an anxious plagiarist, but a more or less transparent literary device, as to which neither Chaucer nor his associates and followers saw any reason to keep silence in their conversation.

All these theses appear to be irrefutable, and in their light we are now ready to discuss certain interesting questions that have suggested

themselves to the curious minds of us moderns. These questions should be kept sharply distinct, however, from the theses just enumerated; for we are now venturing into the domain of conjecture. Our guesses may be more or less probable, but, right or wrong, they cannot affect the soundness of the most pregnant and unforced propositions already established.

First and foremost, did Chaucer originate the erroneous notion that one Lollius (a real name) wrote a (lost) history of the Trojan War or, at all events, a (lost) book of some kind on the matter of Troy?

A priori one would answer this question in the negative, most decidedly. It is seldom possible to discover the actual originator of anything — especially of a current error. Whatever might have led Chaucer to make this mistake would have been just as likely to lead somebody else to make it before him. The mere fact that Chaucer found the name Lollius, not all alone by itself, but in a context that somehow connected it with Troy, suggests as a distinct probability that some predecessor had similarly discovered it. Finally, the fact that Chaucer's learned friends Gower and Strode allowed his erroneous opinion, published in *The House of Fame*, to pass without challenge, and suffered him to utilize the error, uncorrected, as a part of the fiction in the *Troilus*, a poem dedicated to them and doubtless discussed with them in the process of composition — all this certainly suggests that they shared his error, and, therefore, that this was a matter of common misinformation among the learned in the latter part of the fourteenth century. However, the question whether Chaucer originated the error or merely adopted it, is a matter of no consequence. If one prefers to regard Chaucer as the initial mistaker, no harm can be done. I am far from wishing to exonerate the poet, for he was no *doctor irrefragibilis*. He did make blunders now and then.[1] So do we all. One mistake more or less counts for nothing in his record, or yours, or mine, in a puzzle-headed world.

The objection that we cannot find the statement anywhere before Chaucer should not daunt us until we discover the precise source from which he drew his information about Trophee,[2] about the Bret Glascurion, about Hermes Ballenus, about Elcanor, about Lymote,[3] and

---

[1] See p. 80, below.   [3] *House of Fame*, 1208, 1273, 516, 1274.

[2] *Monk's Tale*, B 3307 (see p. 60, above).

so on. It makes no difference, logically, whether the information in these cases is correct or incorrect. The point is, that Chaucer derived it from some source that we cannot trace with assurance or cannot trace at all. In other words, he and his contemporaries had (as we sometimes forget) sources of information or misinformation which are either not accessible to us, having perished, or which our antiquaries have not yet unearthed.

Take the case of Hermes Ballenus. Here the reference to Ballenus has been traced to the *Roman de la Rose*,[1] but the French poem does not connect him with Hermes. Yet Chaucer's learning abides the touchstone. He has in mind a certain wise Belinous who found a book of scientific and magical secrets under a statue of Hermes. Where did Chaucer get this information? A question as yet unanswerable. Yet it may be answered any day. The solution may lurk unheeded in the margin of some manuscript of the *Roman*. So in the margin of some other manuscript of something or other was perhaps enshrined a gloss "Lollius maximus scriptor belli Troiani." We have not yet garnered all the sheaves of mediaeval lore, and when the sheaves are garnered, the gleanings will remain, and when all is gleaned, we shall still miss what has perished.

Another instructive example is that of Agathon. This person may have been known to Chaucer as a poet from Dante:

> Euripide v'è nosco, ed Antifonte,
> Simonide, Agatone ed altri più
> Greci che già di lauro ornar la fronte;[2]

or perhaps from Boccaccio's *Amorosa Visione:*

> Claudiano, Persio, ed Agatone.[3]

But from neither of these places could he have got the information that led him to associate Agathon with Alcestis and the daisy :

> No wonder is that Iove hir stellifye,
> As telleth Agaton, for hir goodnesse.[4]

[1] 14601 Méon (Michel, II, 118). See Skeat on *House of Fame*, 1273.

[2] Purg. xxii, 106–108.

[3] v, 50 (MS. note by Child in his copy of Kissner, *Chaucer in seinen Beziehungen zur italienischen Literatur*, p. 9; Koeppel, *Anglia*, XIV, 237).

[4] *Legend of Good Women*, A 513–514 (B 525–526).

This may have been a chance shot, but one finds it hard to dodge the inference that he somehow knew of Agathon as associated with a flower or flowers; and for this point we are aware of no source that could have helped him except Aristotle's *Poetics*,[1] which he could not read.

We must leave the question undecided, then, whether Chaucer was the initial blunderer in the Lollian business. For convenience, we may speak of the error, in what follows, as Chaucer's, though probability seems to favor the idea that he was adopting some traditional mistake.

Chaucer is not the only fourteenth-century poet who puzzles us in this fashion. For example, I should much like to know where Froissart got his names in the pretty story of Architeles and Orphane,[2] which he credits to " a wise poet." Orphane, he says, was " serour *Dane*," i.e. " Diana's sister." [3] Now *Orphane* seems to be a corruption of *Automate*, who really was the wife of Architeles, and she was a daughter of *Danaus*. But Froissart could not read Pausanias.[4]

It is quite true that we cannot point to a particular place in which Chaucer could have found a citation of " Lollius de Bello Troiano." Still, we can easily exhibit sources from which he might have derived equally remarkable literary lore. We know where he might have found the story, on the authority of " Philosophus ad Maximum," that a committee of eminent Romans, representing various professions, decided that the god of Clemency was to be their chief deity.[5] We know where he could have found the statement that Seneca " in tragedia quadam " tells how Nero, in a vision, was seen in hell bathing in molten gold and inviting a crowd of lawyers (" venale genus hominum ") to join him.[6]

---

[1] ix, p. 1451b 21 (Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 1889, p. 763). Cf. Skeat, III, xxxii-xxxiv.

[2] *Joli Buisson*, 2102 ff. (Scheler, II, 62 ff.).

[3] 2111. Perhaps *Dane* means *Daphne* here, as in Froissart's *Espinette Amoureuse*, 1569 ff. (Scheler, I, 132–138,) and in his *Joli Buisson*, 3156 (II, 94), and in Chaucer; but *Dyane* is mentioned in *Buisson*, 2159, and Chaucer has to warn his readers not to confuse " Penneus doughter " with the goddess (*Knight's Tale*, A 2062–2064).

[4] vii, 1, 3. Cf. also his story of Narcissus (*Joli Buisson*, 3252 ff., Scheler, II, 96 ff.) with the ἧσσον γνώριμος tale in Pausanias, ix, 31, 6.

[5] Ward, Catalogue of Romances, III, 109, § 24.

[6] Crane, *Jacques de Vitry*, pp. 14, 148; cf. Ward, *Catalogue*, III, 135, § 136.

And finally — not to multiply examples — we know where he could have found an account of the celebrated interview between Diogenes and Alexander credited to " Saturnus qui illustrium virorum scripsit hystorias."[1] On the whole, then, it seems rather probable that the error which made Lollius an authority on Troy was not initially Chaucer's — that he picked up the item somewhere among the miscellanea of the middle ages.

More interesting is the inquiry whether or not the error about Lollius (be it Chaucer's or *Anon.'s*) sprang from a misunderstanding of a famous passage in Horace — the beginning of the second Epistle of the First Book:

> Troiani belli scriptorem, maxime Lolli,
> Dum tu declamas Romae, Praeneste relegi.

This theory was long ago proposed by Latham,[2] and has met with considerable favor, though rejected with contumely in some quarters.

The *a priori* case for Latham's hypothesis is uncommonly strong. For (1) the initial blunderer did not invent the name Lollius: it is a real name. He found it *somewhere*. (2) He did not invent the idea that Lollius was a writer on the Trojan War. He found that idea, as well as the name, *somewhere*. The chances are, of course, that he found both the name and the notion in the same place and at the same time; and the place must have been an accessible place. Horace's epistle fulfills all the conditions, and fulfills them brilliantly.[3] Reluctance to accept Latham's idea seems to arise from reluctance to accuse Chaucer, or anybody else, of so considerable a blunder. Still, some one must have blundered somehow sometime, — for without a blunder the belief that a Lollius wrote on the Trojan War could not have been entertained by Chaucer or his contemporaries, — and we shall see presently that to get the Horatian verses wrong was by no means difficult or discreditable.

---

[1] Ward, III, 119, § 9.   [2] *Athenaeum*, October 3, 1868, No. 2136, II, 433.

[3] Chaucer never mentions Horace by name, though he uses a few bits, doubtless picked up at secondhand. Several lines of this Epistle, however, including the first four verses, are quoted in John of Salisbury's *Polycraticus*, vii, 9 (ed. Webb, II, 128), as Axon remarked (*Notes and Queries*, 9th Series, III, 224), and other lines occur elsewhere in the same treatise. Chaucer is thought to have known this work of John's, though the question (I think) is still unsettled. Cf. Lowes, *Modern Language Notes*, XXV, 87–89. If Chaucer was not the initial blunderer, this point is of no consequence.

To accept Latham's conjecture does not carry the obligation to explain precisely how the error came about, — to select, in other words, that one among several possibilities that was actually the process into which the blunderer was betrayed. The more possibilities there were, the greater the chance that we have the right passage before us. Some of these possibilities we may now review, premising that *maxime*, as a mere superlative (not *Maxime* as a part of the name) must underlie all mediaeval ways of interpreting the passage, since the discovery that the *Maximus* was the surname of Horace's young friend is rather modern.

Ten Brink long ago conjectured that the text which caused the error had *scriptorum* for *scriptorem* and *te legi* for *relegi*.[1] Possible, no doubt, but by no means likely! Nor were two corruptions necessary. *Scriptorum* alone would have sufficed, for the passage would then have seemed to mean: "O Lollius, greatest of writers on the Trojan War, while you have been declaiming [your poem] at Rome, I have read it over again at Praeneste." *Scriptor* for *scriptorem* would have had the same result.

So far we have tacitly assumed that *Praeneste* would have been immediately understood by a mediaeval reader as meaning "at Praeneste"; but that is a very large assumption indeed, — particularly when one remembers that Chaucer took Via Appia for the name of a town three miles from Rome on the strength of "Vade igitur in tertium miliarium ab urbe via quae Appia nuncupatur":

> "Goth forth to Via Appia," quod she,
> "That fro the toun ne stant but myles three."[2]

Proper names are ever and always a pitfall, and in the middle ages no reader, lay or cleric, could hope to keep his foot out of the snare. In estimating, therefore, the chances of misinterpretation, we should not forget the difficulties offered by the second verse. If our friend the initial blunderer had a good mediaeval text of these two lines, what he read was not nicely punctuated and decked out with enlightening capitals. It ran as follows:

> Scriptorem belli troiani maxime lolli
> dum tu declamas rome preneste relegi.

---

[1] *Chaucer, Studien,* 1870, p. 87   [2] *Second Nun's Tale,* G 172–173.

What was he to make out of *preneste?*   Was it *preneste* or *preueste?*
The former meant nothing to him, unless he happened to be an un-
commonly good geographer.   As for *preueste*, what was that?   Could
it be *pre ueste?*   Hardly.   An adverb, then?   What adverb?   And so
he gives up *preneste* or *preueste* as a whole.   But, since he would be
eager to read what he could, and was constrained to let the rest go —
as we all do in corrupt or unintelligible passages — he would have
grasped at the *te* as presumably a pronoun, — and then he had " O
greatest Lollius, I have read *you*, a writer on the Trojan War, over
again, while you have been declaiming [your poem] at Rome."

Or suppose some careless reader or excerptor ran together the head-
ing of the epistle "Ad Lollium" or "Ad Lollium consularem" or "Ad
Maximum Lollium" or "Ad Lollium Maximum"[1] with the initial
words: — "Ad Lollium maximum scriptorem belli Troiani."   Less
than that has often raised strange spirits from the mediaeval deep.
That such a trick had in fact got itself played before Chaucer's time
is an ascertained fact, for in one twelfth-century manuscript of Horace
the title of the poem is actually "Ad lollium scriptorem."[2]   This is
Burney MS. 178 in the British Museum.   The fact that the contents of
the Epistle are in large part a compendium of Trojan matters must not
be forgotten in weighing the chances that the Lollian error originated
somehow from a misreading or misunderstanding of the opening lines.

Even if there were no more to be said, I think Latham's hypothesis
would be pretty well demonstrated as extremely probable, since, as
already noted, every additional possibility increases the chance that
he hit upon the right passage.   Yet one must admit that the conjec-
tures so far considered imply a further error in passing from the second
line to what follows, since in verses 3 ff. Horace clearly speaks of the
" writer on the Trojan War " *in the third person*.   Let us see, therefore,
what might have happened to some merely humanly fallible but not
abnormally ignorant or careless reader ("even as you or I") who had
a correct text before him, who knew that *Praeneste* means at Pales-
trina, and who recognized " scriptorem belli Troiani " as Homer.

> Scriptorem belli Troiani, maxime Lolli,
> Dum tu declamas Romae, Praeneste relegi.

---

[1] All these headings occur in manuscripts.
[2] Hauthal's Acron, II, 374, note. I have had the heading verified at the Museum.

From this passage our hypothetical reader would have gathered that the Lollius addressed was a person of great importance, — for he could not have known that *Maxime* is a proper name here. Further, as many readers still do, he would inevitably have taken *scriptorem* as the object as well of *declamas* as of *relegi*, and so would have arrived at the opinion that the person addressed was engaged in reciting at Rome some version of Homer — presumably, since he was at Rome, a Latin version, doubtless of his own composition. Thus the passage, though correctly written and in the main correctly translated, would have seemed to him to bear the clear meaning that there once was a Roman, in ancient times, who composed and recited at Rome a Latin poem, of much importance and dignity, founded on Homer, and relating the main events in the Trojan War, with which, be it remembered, a large part of what follows in the Epistle is concerned.

"Lollius maximus poeta et amicus Horatii Romae declamabat versus de bello Troiano" would, I think, be a fit summary of such an observation; and nothing more would be wanted to make current the item of misinformation which Chaucer picked up somewhere and utilized for his own purposes. I am not asserting that this is precisely the way in which the Lollian error sprang from the Horatian passage: my point is merely that this in one possible way — and that it required no error in text or enormous blundering in translation. Or suppose some one referred, quite correctly, to "Horatius ad Lollium de Bello Troiano." Such a reference might easily have given rise to "Lollius de bello Troiano" — and again the trick is done.

Anything that may have tended to associate the name of Lollius with the Trojan War is pertinent in this inquiry. We may note, therefore, that the Ninth Ode of Horace's Fourth Book is dedicated to a Lollius, whom the middle ages could hardly be expected to distinguish sharply from him of the Epistle, and that much of the ode, like much of the Epistle, is devoted to Homer and the matter of Troy. It is humbly submitted that if a mediaeval scholar read this ode and the Epistle, and inferred therefrom that Lollius wrote something on Troy, the error was not so surprising as that of Speght when he dug out Lollius Urbicus from the Augustan History, turned him into a Lollius of Urbino, and — though he was expressly declared to have

written a history "sui temporis" — cheerfully equated him with the alleged source of Chaucer's *Troilus*.[1]

Again, suppose the following scholium of the pseudo-Acron on the ode got separated from the text:

Ad Marcum Lollium scrĭbit consularem adfirmans immortalia futura scripta sua, quamuis ante eum sint alii meliores poetae; nam nec Homeri magnitudinem obstare quominus Pindarus et alii poetae, qui post eum orti sunt, clari essent.[2]

A careless reader might easily have taken *sua* to refer to Lollius, not *Horace*,[3] and so Lollius' reputation as a poet of importance, though inferior to Homer, might have become a current fact of mediaeval information. The mention of Homer would have been enough to prompt the further inference that Lollius too had busied himself with the tale of Troy. The name of Pindar would have helped rather than hindered, for, as we know, " Pindarus " passed in the middle ages as a Latin poet who had translated Homer — as the author, in short, of the extant *Ilias Latina*.[4]

Until some positive evidence turns up, I think we may take it as pretty well established that the Epistle of Horace, assisted perhaps by the ode or the scholium or by both, is the authority for the mediaeval notion that one Lollius was a writer of importance on the Trojan War.

In order to test the reasonableness of the opinion that Chaucer or some predecessor was capable of misunderstanding Horace's lines in the manner suggested by Latham, we could cite other errors of the poet's, fit to range with that already quoted about the Appian Way.[5] " Partriches winges " on Fame's feet, from Virgil's " pedibus celerem et pernicibus alis," will serve for one.[6] The error about Plato (for Solomon) and " his book Senior; "[7] Brutus and Cassius run together

---

[1] See p. 83, below.

[2] Ed. Hauthal, I, 412 (cf. 415); ed. Keller, I, 355.

[3] The heading of the ode — "Ad Lollium de immortalitate carminum suorum " — may have helped to mislead.

[4] See, for summary information, Bährens, *Poetae Latini Minores*, III (1881), 4–5. I do not see why the attachment of Pindar's name to this text in the middle ages may not have come from a misunderstanding of this same gloss.

[5] P. 77, above.

[6] *House of Fame*, 1391–1392.

[7] *Canon's Yeoman's Tale*, G 1448 ff.

into one name, so that " Brutus Cassius " becomes the ringleader in the conspiracy against Caesar,[1] and, *per contra*, Ascanius and Iulus made into two distinct persons;[2] Busiris confused with Diomedes of Thrace;[3] Titan identified with Tithonus;[4] Corus (or Thorus) as a seagod;[5] Marcia (Marsyas) losing *her* skin;[6] " Persi regis " translated by " the king of Perciens "[7] — these and many other venial sins, familiar to every student, may suffice to assure us that Chaucer was not superior to human frailty.[8]

And we all know that even professional scholars in the middle ages were quite unable, from the circumstances in which they worked, to avoid what seem to us astounding blunders. Examples are hardly called for, but one set may be entertaining. Walter Burley, who died about the time of Chaucer's birth, was a man of real learning who enjoyed the title of " doctor planus et perspicuus." He taught philosophy at Oxford, and is said to have been for a time the tutor of Edward III,

---

[1] *Monk's Tale*, B 3887 ff.

[2] *House of Fame*, 177–178. This may be real learning, however (see Roscher, s. v. *Iulus*).

[3] *Monk's Tale*, B 3293–3294. See Shannon, *Modern Philology*, XI, 227–229.

[4] *Troilus*, iii, 1464–1470 (see p. 116, below).

[5] *Legend of Good Women*, 2422.

[6] *House of Fame*, 1229 ff. Chaucer never could have understood Dante's cryptic utterance " quando Marsia traesti Della vagina delle membra sue " (*Par.*, i, 20–21) unless he had known the story, and Ovid (*Met.*, vi, 383 [*satyri*], 384 [*quem*], and 392 [*illum*]) makes the gender clear. Cf. *Teseide*, xi, 62: "Nel quale si vedea Marsia sonando, Sè con Apollo nel sonar provando."

[7] *Boethius*, bk. ii, prose 2, l. 47 (Skeat).

[8] As illustrations of the errors which a poet might make in the fourteenth century, even in treating of commonplace matters, the following examples would be enlightening, if light were really needed. Froissart makes it Proserpine for whom Orpheus went to Hades: she could not return with him because she had eaten (*Joli Buisson*, 3164–3191, Scheler, II, 94–95). In *Le Trésor Amoureux*, wrongly ascribed to Froissart, Adonis is the son of Venus and pursues Atalanta (1719 ff., Scheler, III, 190 ff.). Froissart's Enclimpostair, son of Morpheus (*Paradys d'Amour*, 28, Scheler, I, 2), has become famous through Chaucer's adoption (*Book of the Duchess*, 167; cf. *Englische Studien*, XXVI, 321 ff.). In *L'Orloge Amoureux* Tubulus (apparently Tibullus) is said to have died for love: "Ce fu pour lui une honnourable fin " (1120–1130, Scheler, I, 85). In the *Joli Buisson* Narcissus dies for love of Echo, whose face he thinks he sees in the fountain (3252 ff., Scheler, II, 96 ff.), and Cepheus is killed by falling from a tree which he had climbed to see if Hero was coming (3216 ff., II, 95–96).

and later of the Black Prince. He certainly enjoyed the royal favor. One of his most popular books — probably compiled as a university manual — was the *Liber de Vita et Moribus Philosophorum Poetarum- que Veterum*. Dr. Knust, who has edited this work, gives an amusing list of some of the curious mistakes that it contains. Burley confuses Epaminondas with Epimenides, Isocrates with Socrates, Xenophanes with Xenophon, Agesilaus with Arcesilaus, Africanus major with Africanus minor, Cato of the *Distichs* and Cato the Censor with Cato Uticensis, Publius (i.e. Publilius) Syrus with Publius Terentius, Pliny the Elder with Pliny the Younger.[1] In his chapter on Horace, he tells how " Oracius Flaccus poeta illustris," when he was *pontifex maximus* and was dedicating a temple to Jupiter, received the news of his son's death, but did not allow it to disturb him in the sacred ceremony — an anecdote which should stand to the credit of Horatius Pulvillus.[2] Titus Livius appears in Burley's pages as " historiographus et trage- diarum scriptor," by confusion, of course, with Livius Andronicus.[3]

We can come nearer home, however. Somebody in the middle ages blundered about Lollius somehow: that is beyond dispute. Is it in- credible that the blunder should have come from the Horatian pas- sage ? Let us test the question again — this time by reviewing some of the mistakes that modern scholars have made in discussing the Lollian problem itself.

In the Scriptores Historiae Augustae two distinct persons named Lollius Urbicus are mentioned, — one a magistrate and general of the second century of our era,[4] the other an historian of the third.[5]

The first of these was a man of mark in his day, and we have a good deal of documentary evidence about him.[6] He was legatus in Britain in the reign of Antonius Pius;[7] he is mentioned by Fronto [8] and Apuleius [9] as a contemporary; and there are at least six inscriptions

---

[1] *Gualteri Burlaei Liber de Vita et Moribus Philosophorum*, pp. 400–401.

[2] Cap. 110, ed. Knust, p. 350.

[3] Cap. 88, p. 310.   [4] *Antoninus Pius*, 5.

[5] *Antoninus Diadumenus*, 9.

[6] Von Rohden and Dessau, *Prosopographia*, II, 297.

[7] " [Antoninus] per legatos suos plurima bella gessit, nam et Brittanos per Lol- lium Urbicum vicit legatum alio muro caespiticio summotis barbaris ducto," etc. (*Ant. Pius*, 5).

[8] *Ad Amicos*, ii, 7.   [9] *De Magia*, 2.

that concern him, — two Roman,[1] two British,[2] and two African.[3] One of these, which relates to the *vallum* of Antoninus (Graham's Dyke), has long been familiar to archaeologists, and was discussed by the admirable Horseley in 1732.[4]

The second Lollius Urbicus is known only from a single passage in the *Life of Diadumenus* ascribed to Lampridius, which, however, suffices to prove that he lived in the reigns of Macrinus and Heliogabalus, and that he wrote a " history of his own time." [5] This personage was introduced into English literary history, as Chaucer's Lollius, by Speght, who, in the Folio of 1598, included him in the list of authors appended to his Glossary as " *Lollius*, an Italian Historiographer, borne in the citie of Vrbine." [6] *Urbicus*, to be sure, is a derivative of *urbs*, and is not a synonym for *Urbinas*, "of Urbino," but that made no difference: Speght's error became current. Dr. Timothy Thomas, in 1721, added some learned material to Speght's note, and, having consulted the Scriptores Historiae Augustae, included Lollius in the list of authors appended to the Glossary to Urry's Chaucer as " an Italian Historiographer born at *Urbino*, who lived under the Emperors *Macrinus* and *Heliogabalus*, in the beginning of the Third Century," remarking that he "is said to have written the History of his own Time, and also the Life of the Emperor *Diadumenus* the Son of *Macrinus*." [7] This note not only repeats Speght's mistranslation of *Urbicus* (as if it were *Urbinas*), but involves a wrong inference from the words of Lampridius. Lollius Urbicus *did* write a " History of his Own Time," which Lampridius cites for certain details about Diadumenus, but there is no foundation for the statement that he *also* wrote a biography of that boy-emperor; whatever he had to

---

[1] *C.I.L.* VI, i, 6 (No. 28); VI, ii, 1410 (No. 10707).

[2] Hübner, *C.I.L.*, VII, 180, 201, Nos. 1041, 1125.

[3] Wilmanns, *C.I.L.*, VIII, i, 607, Nos. 6705, 6706.

[4] *Britannia Romana*, pp. 197–198 (cf. pp. 50, 51). This is Hübner's No. 1125.

[5] The author of the Life cites Lollius Urbicus for details about the murder of Diadumenus given " in historia sui temporis." This murder took place A.D. 218.

[6] Sig. Bbbb. ii, v° (ed. 1602, sig. Uuu, iiii, leaf 4, v°; ed. 1687, sig. Ssss, v°).

[7] *A short Account of some of the Authors cited by Chaucer*, appended to the *Glossary* in Urry's Chaucer, 1721, p. 80. Perhaps Dr. Thomas went, not to the Scriptores, but to Gerard Vossius, *De Historicis Latinis*, bk. ii, ch. 2 (2d ed., 1651, p. 176), whose account of Lollius, however, is accurate.

say on the subject was obviously contained in this same *Historia sui Temporis.*

Warton, in 1774, remarked that Chaucer's *Troilus* " is said to be formed on an old history, written by Lollius, a native of Urbino." [1] But it does not appear that he accepted *Urbicus* and *Urbinas* as synonymous. At all events, he expressly states that " Lollius Urbicus," the historian of the third century, " could not be Chaucer's Lollius." [2] He makes an odd mistake, however, when he says: " It is extraordinary, that Du Fresne, in the *Index Auctorum*, used by him for his Latin glossary, should mention this Lollius Urbicus of the third century," none of whose works, as Warton " apprehends," remain. [2] It would indeed be extraordinary if Du Cange had pretended to use this lost author. The truth is, he does nothing of the kind. His *Index Auctorum*, as he states expressly, is meant to include all the writers " inferioris Latinitatis " that he knew of, both those whom he used in his *Glossarium* and those whom he did not; [3] and the way in which he mentions Lollius Urbicus [4] makes it quite clear that he had no knowledge of that historian except what was afforded by the passage of Lampridius already mentioned. [5] Another strange remark of Warton's is the assertion that "Boccac[c]io himself, in the DECAMERON, mentions the story of Troilus and Cressida in Greek verse"; [6] which, adds Warton, " I suppose had been translated by some of the fugitive Greeks with whom he was connected, from a romance on that subject." I venture to suggest that this remark is quite as extraordinary — all circumstances considered — as Chaucer's erroneous registration of Lollius as an historian of the Trojan War.

[1] *History of English Poetry*, 1774, § 14, I, 384.

[2] *Ibid.*, note a.

[3] " Caeteros illaudatos inferioris Latinitatis Scriptoribus laudatis adjungendos " (*Glossarium*, ed. 1681, cols. 78–79).

[4] " Lollius Urbicus, Historicus, vix. sub Macrino and Heliogabalo. Vide Vossium " (col. 129). Gerard Vossius, *De Historicis Latinis*, ii, 2 (2d ed., 1651, p. 176), refers to Lampridius as our only source of knowledge on this writer.

[5] It is only fair to say that Warton contributes some really valuable information about the *Troilus* material.

[6] I, 351 (cf. 384). See *Decameron*, 6th day, introduction: "E Dioneo insieme con Lauretta di Trojolo e di Criseida cominciarono a cantare." That is all. Cf. Warton's *Emendations and Additions* to Vol. I, p. 385 (in Vol. II); Wilkins, *Boccaccio Studies*, p. 52.

From Speght's and Dr. Thomas's assertion and Warton's hesitating remarks, the supposed Lollius of Urbino (who owes his existence solely to Speght's misunderstanding of the adjective *Urbicus*), became almost inseparably attached to Chaucer. The eminent Heyne, the philological dictator of Germany in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, actually translated the name "Lollius of Urbino" into Latin, oblivious of the fact that it was a mere blunder, and asserted, in his famous edition of Virgil, that Chaucer derived his *Troilus* from "Lollius Urbinas et Guido de Colonna."[1]

Joly, in referring to this error of Heyne's, makes a mistake of his own, for he says: — "Il est, par ce passage même, évident que Heyne ne parle de Lollius que sur l'autorité de Chaucer."[2] Certainly Heyne did not derive his *Urbinas* from Chaucer, who does not associate Lollius with that city or with any city — except Troy! One suspects that Joly took *Urbicus* as a synonym of *Urbinas* anyhow, for, in connection with his quotation from Heyne, he remarks that Schoell mentions the nonexistent "Lollius d'Urbin" as a real author. Now the fact is that Schoell knows nothing of any Lollius of Urbino. His entry concerns only the historian Lollius Urbicus and is perfectly sober and accurate: "Lollius Urbicus, auteur d'un histoire de son temps, c'est-à-dire de celui de Macrin et d'Eliogabale."[3]

A recent Romance scholar of repute, Marcus Landau, in an attempt to correct some of the old errors, has embroiled the whole subject afresh. According to Landau, "Dryden confused [Chaucer's] Lollius with Lollius Urbicus, the author of a lost work on the Emperor Severus, and made out of him a Lollius of Urbino, who according to him, was Chaucer's and Shakspere's source."[4] Now what Dryden wrote in the

---

[1] "Obseruabimus tandem recentiorum quoque fabularum factum esse Troilum argumentum, Lollii quidem Vrbinatis et Guidonis de Colonna. Vnde Chaucer duxit suum Troilum et Cressida" (Excursus xvii on *Aeneid* i). This passage does not occur in the first edition (1771, II, 127–128) or the second (1787, II, 160–161), but makes its first appearance in the third (Leipzig, 1800, II, 212; 1803, II, 178). It is also found in the fourth edition (Wagner's), 1832, II, 250, and in Lemaire's edition, 1819, II, 203. The London "third edition" (1793), II, 155–156 does not contain it.

[2] *Benoît de Sainte-More*, I, 217, note 1.

[3] *Histoire abrégée de la littérature romaine*, Paris, 1815, III, 146.

[4] "Chaucer also, der ebenfalls ein Epos von Troilus und Cressida geschrieben, gibt es für die Uebersetzung des lateinischen Werks eines gewissen Lollius aus.

preface to his own *Troilus and Cressida* (1679), is bad enough, but it does not accord with Landau's account. "The Original story," says Dryden, " was Written by one *Lollius*, a *Lombard*, in Latin verse, and Translated by *Chaucer* into English: intended I suppose a Satyr on the Inconstancy of Women: I find nothing of it among the Ancients; not so much as the name once *Cressida* mention'd. Shakspear, . . . in the Aprenticeship of his Writing, model'd it into that Play, which is now call'd by the name of *Troilus* and *Cressida*." Certainly it cannot be alleged that Dryden made a Lollius of Urbino out of Lollius Urbicus. He says not a word about Lollius *Urbicus*, and does not mention Urbino, but declares that Chaucer's Lollius was a Lombard — and Urbino (as I suppose Landau knew) is not in Lombardy. Dryden's information might all have been derived from Chaucer's *Troilus* itself except the statement that Lollius was a Lombard. This he doubtless inferred from Speght's *Life of Geffrey Chaucer* in the folio of 1598, where we read: " Troilus and Creseid called *Throphe* in the Lumbard tongue, translated: not *verbatim*, but the Argument thence taken, and most cunningly amplified by Chaucer." [1] Speght's language, indeed, is echoed by Dryden in the Preface to his *Fables* (1700), when he remarks that " *Troilus* and *Cressida* was written by a *Lombard* Author; but much amplified by our *English* Translatour, as well as beautified." [2] In the folio Chaucer of 1602 Speght's note appears in the following form: " Troilus and Creseid called *Throphe* in the Lumbard tongue, was translated out of Latin, as in the preface to the second booke of Troilus and Creseid he confesseth in these wordes:

> " To euery louer I me excuse,
>   That of no sentiment I this endite,
>   But out of Latin in my tonge it write." [3]

Miss Hammond [4] also seriously mistakes Dryden. She writes: " Dryden, in the preface to his ' Troilus and Cressida,' said that ' the

Diesen sonst unbekannten Lollius verwechselte Dryden mit Lollius Urbicus, dem Verfasser eines verloren gegangenen Werks über Kaiser Severus und machte aus ihm einen Lollius aus Urbino, der Chaucers und Shakespeare's Quelle gewesen sein sollte " (Landau, *Giovanni Boccaccio*, 1877, pp. 91–92).

[1] Sig. c, i, r°.   [2] Sig. B.

[3] Sig. c. j. v° (so also in the folio of 1687, sig. b v°).

[4] *Chaucer, a Bibliographical Manual*, 1908, p. 95. I take occasion once more to express my sense of the high value of this indispensable book.

original story was written by one Lollius, in Lombard verse,'" whereas Dryden says distinctly, " by one Lollius, a Lombard, in Latin verse." " This he derived, it is probable," she adds," from the note in Speght's glossary — ' Lollius, an Italian Historiographer borne in the citie of Urbine.'" As to this we note (1) that this remark is not in Speght's Glossary, but in the list of authors appended to his glossary, and (2) that Speght's note does not say that Lollius wrote in Lombard verse; — does not, indeed, mention Lombardy at all.

Miss Hammond also makes several mistakes in her account of Lollius Urbicus the historian cited in the *Life of Diadumenus* in the so-called Augustan History. In the first place, she says that this life was " written about 400 A.D." But soon after she remarks that the Augustan History " was written during the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine," that is, A.D. 284–337. Perhaps, then, 400 is a misprint for 300. Further, she remarks that, " as the Augustan History was written during the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, Lollius has been considered as of the third century." This, however, is *not* the reason for so dating him. The reason is that the language of the *Life of Diadumenus* (no matter when the Augustan History was written) implies beyond the possibility of misapprehension that this Lollius was living at the time of the murder of Diadumenus, which took place in 218.

But this is not all. Professor Lounsbury, in giving an account of the Lollius legend, makes a mistake of his own. He says that the Lollius Urbicus who is mentioned by Capitolinus as conquering the Britons in the reign of Antoninus Pius and the Lollius Urbicus who is cited by Lampridius as having written a history of his own times, are " presumably the same man," ignoring the fact that they lived in different centuries, and adds that " nothing has ever been heard of him or it beyond these two brief references." [1] Yet, as we have seen, much has been heard of the elder Lollius Urbicus besides the reference to him in the so-called Capitolinus. Further, Lounsbury appears to accept " of Urbino " as a good translation of the adjective *Urbicus*. It would be hard to find a more striking example of the way in which bits of information and misinformation combined get adrift in the learned world.

[1] *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 405–406.

The supposition that Chaucer blundered in reading Horace "involves," says Lounsbury, "the . . . assumption that a man who was sufficiently familiar with Latin to translate with reasonable accuracy a philosophical work, written in that tongue, was capable of confusing in an easy sentence forms so widely distinct as those of the genitive and the vocative case."[1] This statement involves a curious oversight. If Chaucer identified *Lolli* in Horace's line with *scriptorem*, what he confused was certainly not the genitive and the vocative, — and anyhow, the genitive and the vocative of *Lollius* are not "widely distinct" forms. Hamilton makes a different mistake about cases when he defines Lounsbury's "main premise" as the proposition that Chaucer "would not have made the slip of mistaking a genitive for an ablative."[2] No ablative or genitive is involved in the question.

May we not argue that these errors of Lounsbury and Hamilton are quite as unlikely to have been committed by those scholars as the error suggested by Latham was unlikely to have been committed by Chaucer or some forerunner?

Even Dr. Latham's note, which is printed a plain type in a modern journal,[3] has been more than once unintentionally misrepresented, as if he thought Chaucer were the initial blunderer. What he suggests, on the contrary, is clearly that the mistake had been previously made by somebody unknown, and that "by the time of Chaucer" Lollius had come to be regarded, on the basis of that blunder, as a writer on the Trojan War.[4] It is rather odd that Rossetti himself, in 1873, appears to make this mistake with regard to Latham,[5] though Latham's letter to the *Athenaeum* was written in reply to a theory of Rossetti's published in the immediately preceding number of this journal,[6] and

[1] *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 409–410.

[2] *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde to Guido delle Colonne's Historia Trojana*, p. 40, note.

[3] *Athenaeum*, No. 2136, Oct. 3, 1868, II, 433.

[4] "My own view, and that I believe of others, is . . . that by the time of Chaucer the name of the person there addressed had become attached to the person written about."

[5] "It appears to me that the most reasonable . . . suggestion is that made . . . by Dr. R. G. Latham — that Chaucer has, by some blunder or confusion, got the name Lollius out of Horace's line" (*Chaucer's Troylus and Cryseyde compared with Boccaccio's Filostrato*, 1873, p. vii).

[6] *Athenæum*, No. 2135, Sept. 26, 1868.

though Rossetti followed Latham in the very next number [1] with a communication accepting the doctor's theory and abandoning his own. Miss Hammond is under the same misapprehension.[2] She adds the remark: "Note that already Bradshaw (see Prothero's Memoir, p. 216) had made the same suggestion as did Latham." But the passage in Prothero records no such suggestion.

We may conclude with a blunder by another distinguished scholar, pertinent here, because its perpetrator is accepting Latham's conjecture. "La invenzione del nome *Lollio Urbico* fu suggerita al Chaucer probabilmente," writes Hortis, "dall' ode oraziana: Trojani belli scriptorem maxime Lolli etc." [3] As to this there are four observations to make: — (1) Chaucer does not speak of Lollius *Urbicus;* (2) if he did, he would not be inventing the name, for it is a real name, borne by at least two historical personages; (3) Lollius *Urbicus* could not be invented by anybody on the basis of the Horatian line; (4) Horace's epistle is not an ode.

I have not undertaken to catalogue the errors of scholars with regard to the *Troilus* and its sources, but simply to select, from the mass of familiar material,[4] a number of mistakes about Lollius — not mere instances of poor judgment, or of wild theorizing on moot points, but plain honest homespun errors about matters of fact. The point is, of course, that these blunders have been made — *and made about Lollius* — not by persons who, in the days of manuscripts, were casually acquiring miscellaneous information, or groping about in their memories for things once seen but now beyond the scope of verification, but by modern specialists engaged in studying the Lollian problem with printed texts and printed books of reference at their elbows.

My brief review has been undertaken in a spirit of humility, not of censoriousness. Indeed, the very name of Lollius seems to have acted as a spell. A deceptive glamour attends it. Hardly anybody has approached the charmed circle without losing his way and wandering about, pixy-led, mistaking bushes for bears. I can claim no exemption

---

[1] No. 2137, Oct. 10, 1868, II, 465.

[2] P. 96.

[3] *Studj sulle Opere Latine del Boccaccio*, p. 581, note 1.

[4] See the summaries of Hamilton (*The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Troilus and Creseyde to Guido delle Colonne's Historia Trojana*, 1903, pp. 1–50) and Miss Hammond (*Chaucer: a Bibliographical Manual*, 1908, pp. 94 ff., etc.).

from the ban, and feel little doubt that I have blundered somewhere.
Several bad mistakes, indeed, I have already cut out of my manu-
script. Others, I trust, remain to help in establishing the proposition
that I am endeavoring to prove — to wit, the proposition that a
mediaeval error in dealing with the Horatian passage is very probable.

A hitherto unnoted source from which, by easy processes of error
and confusion — such as were inevitable in the middle ages — the
name of Lollius Maximus may have got abroad as that of an authority
on ancient history (or the name of Lollius as that of a *very great* au-
thority on the same), is the account given of Damophilus in Suidas'
lexicon. Among the works of this " philosopher and sophist " are
mentioned, Φιλόβιβλος, πρῶτος περὶ ἀξιοκτήτων βιβλίων, πρὸς Λόλλιον
Μάξιμον, Περὶ βίου ἀρχαίων· καὶ ἔτερα πάμπολλα.[1] From this is appears
that Damophilus was credited (1) with a work entitled Φιλόβιβλος ad-
dressed or dedicated to Lollius Maximus, and (2) with another work
"On the Life of the Ancients." Now it would not have been a matter
of much difficulty for the words Λόλλιον Μάξιμον περὶ βίου ἀρχαίων to
get shuffled together in somebody's mind, with the result that Lollius
came to be regarded as a writer on the life of the ancients, or even as a
biographer of the men of old.[2] This is suggested merely as something
possible enough. Damophilus, the Bithynian, is cited as a curious
antiquary by Julian,[3] and there may have been accounts of him in
Latin as well as in Greek.

In conclusion, let us not forget that there was once a Lollius who
did treat of the Trojan War at least twice, though in the briefest
fashion. This was Lollius Bassus, of the first century of our era. His
epigrams on this subject are worth quoting. The first is a compliment
to Rome:

---

[1] Suidas, s. v. Δαμόφιλος, I, 1169–1170, Bernhardy.

[2] A part of this error has certainly been perpetrated by Philip Smith. In Smith's
Dictionary, I, 937, he speaks of this work of Damophilus as " On the Lives of the
Ancients (περὶ βίων ἀρχαίων)."

[3] *Misopogon*, p. 358 C. Suidas says of Damophilus, ὃν ἀνεθρέψατο Ἰουλιανός.
This is thought to be P. Salvius Julianus, consul A. D. 175 (von Rohden and Des-
sau, *Prosopographia*, III, 166). Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa says that " Damo-
philos . . . war nach Suidas Pflegesohn des M. Salvius Iulianus " — a remark in
which he certainly goes beyond his text. But nobody can touch Lollius, even
secondarily, without suffering for it.

Ἄρρηκτοι Μοιρῶν πυμάτην ἐσφράγισαν ὅρκοι
 τῷ Φρυγὶ πὰρ βωμῷ τὴν Πριάμου θυσίην.
Ἀλλὰ σοί, Αἰνεία, στόλος ἱερὸς Ἰταλὸν ἤδη
 ὅρμον ἔχει, πάτρης φροίμιον οὐρανίης.
Ἐς καλὸν ὤλετο πύργος ὁ Τρώϊος· ἦ γὰρ ἐν ὅπλοις
 ἠγέρθη κόσμου παντὸς ἄνασσα πόλις.[1]

The second might almost be called a warning against the hidden rocks and reefs of the Lollian controversy:

Οὐλόμεναι νήεσσι Καφηρίδες, αἵ ποτε νόστον
 ὠλέσαθ' Ἑλλήνων καὶ στόλον Ἰλιόθεν,
πυρσὸς ὅτε ψεύστας χθονίης δνοφερώτερα νυκτὸς
 ἧψε σέλα, τυφλὴ δ' ἔδραμε πᾶσα τρόπις
χοιράδας ἐς πέτρας, Δαναοῖς πάλιν Ἴλιος ἄλλη
 ἔπλετο, καὶ δεκέτους ἐχθροτέρη πολέμου.
Καὶ τὴν μὲν τότ' ἔπερσαν· ἀνίκητος δὲ Καφηρεύς,
 Ναύπλιε· σοὶ γὰρ πᾶν Ἑλλὰς ἔκλαυσε δάκρυ.[2]

Let nobody accuse me of maintaining that Chaucer's Lollius has anything to do with Lollius Bassus — or that Chaucer was a student of the Anthology — or even that the pretty epigram of Agathias on the swallows [3] is the source of certain stanzas of similar tenor in the *Troilus*.[4] Yet, after all, such theories on my part would but add one more to the long list of shipwrecks on this fatal cliff!

[1] *Anth. Pal.*, ix, 236 (Dübner, II, 46–47). [3] v, 237.
[2] *Anth. Pal.*, ix, 289 (Dübner, II, 58). [4] ii, 57–70.

APPENDIX I

ON CHAUCER'S REFERENCES TO HIS SOURCES IN THE TROILUS

In the early part of my paper I made the following postulate: " Chaucer takes quite particular pains to convey the impression that his *Troilus*, from beginning to end, is a faithful translation from the Latin work of Lollius, without any material additions either from other sources or from his own pen " (p. 54); and I promised to prove this proposition in an appendix. I regret the necessity, but am not to blame for it. The case is as clear as Chaucer could make it, but can only be established by going through the poem in the order in which it is written; for the evidence is cumulative, and the effect of any single mention of Lollius or " myn auctor," or of any single allusion to him, may extend far beyond the immediate context.

The following table gives a list of all the references or allusions to a source, along with four or five passages that have no significance but are included for the sake of completeness.

i, 132–133.	iii, 1576.
i, 141–147.	iii, 1774–1775.
i, 159–161.	iii, 1811–iv, 21 (iii, 1817; iv, 18–21).
i, 393–399 (394).	iv, 36–42.
i, 492–497 (495).	iv, 799–805.
ii, 8–49 (13–14, 18, 49).	iv, 1415–1421.
ii, 100–108.	v, 15–21 (19).
ii, 699–700.	v, 799–840 (799, 804, 816, 834).
ii, 1219–1220.	v. 848.
ii, 1564–1568.	v, 946.
ii, 1595–1596.·	v, 1009.
ii, 1700–1701.	v, 1032.
iii, 39–49 (cf. ii, 13–14 with iii, 43–44).	v, 1037–1085 (1037, 1044, 1050, 1051).
iii, 90–91.	
iii, 442–455.	v, 1086–1099.
iii, 470.	v, 1459.
iii, 491–504 (502–503)	v, 1478–1484.
iii, 575–581.	v, 1562–1565.
iii, 967–973.	v, 1646–1666 (1651, 1653).
iii, 1193–1199 (1196, 1199).	v, 1751–1771 (1753, 1758).
iii, 1321–1330.	v, 1776.
iii, 1369–1372.	v, 1803–1804.
iii, 1429.	v, 1854–1855.

"Myn auctor" is certainly "Lollius." On that point no doubt is possible nor does there seem to be any disposition to deny so plain a proposition. Whatever may be said of vaguer attributions (like "as I rede" or "writen as I fynde" or "olde bokes"), Lollius and *myn auctor* are always one and the same person in Chaucer's poem.

"Myn auctor, called Lollius" is first cited in i, 394, and the detail credited to him is certainly to be found in the *Filostrato*[1] — namely, the general purport of Troilus' song in contradistinction to the *ipsissima verba*, which Chaucer pretends to substitute. We note that this passage not only registers Lollius distinctly and definitely as the source of the *Troilus*, but also tends to create the expectation that whenever Chaucer departs from that source, he will give notice, as here, particularly in case he inserts anything. This impression is strengthened as the poem goes on, and therefore the point need not now be pressed. It is enough for the present to recognize that Chaucer here sets up Lollius as his *auctor* and leaves upon our minds the general impression that he purposes to follow him with conscientious fidelity.

But, though this is the first mention of Lollius in the poem, it is not the first place where a particular source is indicated; for when Chaucer refers to "reading," as he does in i, 133 and 159, he is in effect referring to his *auctor*, whose name is soon to be given (in 394). These two passages should not be neglected, and with them must be considered certain intervening lines (141–147) that distinguish the *auctor* Chaucer means to follow (as yet unnamed) from those widely known writers on general Trojan history — Homer and Dictys and Dares. Even before he names Lollius, then, Chaucer has led us to believe that in narrating "the double sorrow of Troilus" he is following a particular *auctor*, and he has revealed to us the contents of that *auctor's* work in two particulars:

(1) But whether that she children hadde or noon,
I rede it nought; therfore I lete it goon (i, 132–133).

(2) In sondry wises shewed, *as I rede,*
   The folk of Troye hir observaunces olde,
   Palladiones feste for to holde (i, 159–161).

---

[1] i, 37: "E quindi lieto si diede a cantare." See Young, pp. 191–192 (and references); Wise, p. 5; Cummings, pp. 158–159.

Now the second of these references is true to the *Filostrato*,[1] but the first is notoriously the opposite, for Boccaccio expressly declares that Cressida had no children.[2] The next mention of " reading " comes soon after the mention of Lollius, namely, in 495, and this time the reference is again true to the *Filostrato*.[3] For the first 500 lines of his poem, then, three of Chaucer's references to his source will suit the formula *Lollius = Boccaccio*,[4] and one will not.[5] For the rest of the book we are left without any further indication — the inference being that Lollius is followed. Yet there are hundreds of verses that do not come from Boccaccio. The significance of all this is plain enough, but it becomes still plainer when we reach Book ii.

Here, in vv. 8–49 of the proem, "myn auctor" appears in great state. Chaucer declares that if Clio will only help him to make good rhymes, nothing more will be necessary in this book,[6] since he is not composing anything original but simply translating from Latin into English. Therefore, he adds, he wishes neither praise nor blame for " all this work," — " for as myn auctor seyde, so seye I." And he closes with the words —

> Sin I have bigonne
> Myn auctor shal I folwen, if I conne.

There is no mistaking the impression that Chaucer wished these lines to convey. They are equivalent to saying that so far he has followed Lollius in a faithful translation (though not, of course, in a literal translation because he is turning that author's Latin into English rhyme), and that he intends to continue in the same way. Yet of the 500 lines immediately preceding, more than 300 are Chaucer's own, and immediately after this express statement, we have more than 200 verses of which hardly a word can be found in the *Filostrato*. These are ii, 50–273, and what is true of them, is true likewise of ii, 323–385, 421–500, 526–553, 603–644, and 666–698. In short, despite the elaborate professions of fidelity to his *auctor*, it appears that about 500

[1] i, 18.   [2] i, 15.

[3] i, 48. Chaucer substitutes " wel rede I " for Boccaccio's " è assai chiaro ed aperto."

[4] *Troilus*, i, 159–161, 394–395, 495.

[5] i, 132–133.

[6] " This book " (10) appears to mean, not the whole poem, but Book ii. At the beginning of Book iii Chaucer invokes Venus and Calliope.

out of the 650 verses that come immediately after the proem are not
from Boccaccio. " Myn auctor," then, as there used for an extensive
look before and after, is strikingly inconsistent with the equation
Boccaccio = Lollius.

But we have not done. Chaucer now appeals once more to his
auctor, this time in introducing an account of Cressida's meditations:

> And what she thoughte, somwhat shal I wryte,
> As to myn auctor listeth for to endyte (ii, 699–700).

The meditations, which take up vv. 701–812, contain much more of
Chaucer than of Boccaccio; and they are immediately followed by
the garden scene (ii, 813–910), which is original with Chaucer,[1] though
the reader could hardly avoid the inference that it too came from
Lollius.

The next appeal to a source is in ii, 1219–1220,[2] where Chaucer says
that " his intent " is to give " the effect " of Cressida's letter " as far
as he can understand." And, in truth, he here condenses the seven-
stanza Italian epistle[3] into five lines. Immediately after, however,
before the impression of this reference to authority has faded from
our minds, Chaucer becomes notably original, departing from Boc-
caccio at v. 1227 and (except for some 50 lines) remaining original
for about 500 verses — to the end of the second book. Yet in this
long passage of original matter he twice pretends to be condensing his
auctor:

> But flee we now prolixitee best is,
> For loue of God, and lat as faste go
> Right to the effect, withouten tales mo (ii, 1564–1566).

> But al passe I, lest ye to longe dwelle;
> For for o fyn is al that ever I telle (ii, 1595–1596).

In both these places Chaucer picks up and continues the effect of
what he had said about condensing the letter (ii, 1219–1220). *There,*

---

[1] See, however, Young, pp. 173–176, where especial attention is given to Anti-
gone's song (ii. 827–875). The general source of this lyric I believe to be Guillaume
de Machaut (*Modern Language Notes*, XXV, 158); but it is certainly in most
respects Chaucer's own.

[2] I pass over ii, 1700–1701, though (in strictness) this passage belongs to the
same class as those mentioned below, p. 97, note 1.

[3] *Filostrato*, ii, 121–127.

he was actually condensing Boccaccio; here he is not condensing anybody, but inventing, and at considerable length. Yet in both cases he wishes the reader to think that he is faithful to his auctor Lollius, though with some abridgement.

Chaucer's procedure, then, as far as the end of Book ii, is quite clear. Having introduced his " auctor Lollius " — his pretended authority for the whole *Troilus* — early in book i (at 394), he recalls him to the reader's mind at convenient intervals. These credits sometimes accord with material that is in the *Filostrato*, but they oftener refer or apply to material that is not. So far, therefore, Lollius is not Boccaccio or anybody else but Lollius — the supposed writer on Troy (celebrated as such in *The House of Fame*) from whom Chaucer (in a fiction) professes to have derived all his material — a Latin writer whom he translates rather closely, never departing from him without due notice.

The proem to Book iii, though not mentioning any *auctor*, is meant to recall (in 39–49) the fiction of fidelity in translating already set forth with such care in the proem to Book ii. We should note the close connection between ii, 13-14, and iii, 43-44:

> That of no sentement I this endyte,
> But out of Latin in my tonge it wryte (ii, 13–14).

> Ye in my naked herte sentement
> Inhelde, and do me shewe of thy swetnesse (iii, 43–44).

Chaucer picks up this fiction again in iii, 90–91:

> His [Troilus'] resons [i.e., his words] as I may my rymes holde,

[i.e., as well as I can reproduce them in rhyme,]

> I yow wol telle, as techen bokes olde.[1]

What follows (92–238) is not in the *Filostrato*, and the whole scene is Chaucer's invention. At 450, however, the matter referred to as " writen in geste "[2] *does* occur in that poem. Here we have a device

---

[1] " Bokes olde " means obviously either " myn auctor Lollius " (with a generalizing plural), or " myn auctor Lollius and other old books." The distinction does not affect our argument.

[2] *Filostrato*, ii, 84 (Cummings, p. 157). It should be noted, however, that this ascription, though it may perhaps be admitted as favoring the equation *Lollius* = *Boccaccio*, is by no means a firm buttress for that formula, since " as written is in

which is several times employed in the *Troilus:* — a detail is mentioned (442–448) as to which the poet professes ignorance, and to this succeeds a fact (introduced by *but*, 449) which he does know, or does find in his *auctor*.[1]

Almost immediately after this Chaucer once more suggests condensation ("shortly of this proces for to pace," iii, 470) though the whole passage is his own. Then come the famous stanzas in which he forestalls criticism (iii, 491–504): " Someone may expect me to rehearse every word and message and look. But that would be tedious, and nobody ever heard of its being done in any history. Besides, even if I wished, I could not;

> " For there was som epistel hem bitwene,
> That wolde, *as seyth myn auctor, wel contene*
> *Neigh half this book, of which him list not write;*
> How sholde I thanne a lyne of it endite ? " (iii, 501–504).

Boccaccio says nothing of the kind. *Auctor*, then, is certainly not Boccaccio.

The next mention of a source is likewise decisive:

> Nought myn auctor fully to declare
> What that she thoughte when he seyde so,
> That Troilus was out of town y-fare,
> As if he seyde ther-of sooth or no;
> *But that, with-oute awayt, with him to go,*
> *She graunted him, sith he hir that bisoughte,*
> *And, as his nece, obeyed as hir oughte.* (iii, 575–581).

This stanza contains two statements about " myn auctor " : — (1) that he does not make it quite clear whether Cressida believed Pandarus; (2) that he *does* assert that she accepted her uncle's invitation.[2] Now Boccaccio asserts nothing of the kind, for the important incident

geste " really covers iii, 451–490, and the Boccaccian passage is no adequate source for much of this. Boccaccio, indeed, seems to allow no actual meeting between the lovers until the night when Cressida yields. Chaucer, on the contrary, declares that they had several interviews in the meantime. On the whole, then, this ascription is rather against the equation than for it.

[1] For similar cases, see i, 492–497; ii, 1700–1701; iii, 575–581, 967–973, 1369–1372; iv, 36–42. The device is a natural one, but we may note that its first employment in the *Troilus* (i, 492–497) comes from the *Filostrato* (i, 48).

[2] For the manner of citation, see p. 96, above.

of the visit to Pandarus is of Chaucer's own imagining. The passage
would be enough, without further evidence, to destroy the equation
auctor Lollius = Boccacio.

Very similar is the next allusion to a source, which comes some fifty-
odd stanzas later in the same episode:

> Can I not seyn, for she bad him not ryse,
> If sorwe it putte out of hir remembraunce,
> Or elles if she tok it in the wyse
> Of duëtee, as for his observaunce;
> *But wel finde I* she dide him this pleasaunce,
> That she him kiste, al-though she syked sore;
> And bad him sitte a-doun with-outen more (iii, 967–973).

Here Chaucer begins by telling us that he does not know why Cressida
neglected to bid Troilus rise (presumably because his auctor Lollius
did not inform him), and then adds something that he *does* " find "
(in Lollius — where else ?). Again no word of all this in Boccaccio!
The same device (where also there is no such matter in the *Filostrato*)
recurs in iii, 1369–1372. Here Chaucer says that he cannot tell the
posies on the rings interchanged by the lovers, but that he *does* " know
well " (i.e., of course, because he found it in Lollius) that Cressida
gave Troilus a gold and azure brooch in which was set a ruby shaped
like a heart.

A little before this last passage (namely, in iii, 1193–1197), Chaucer
expressly mentions his fictitious *auctor*:

> I can no more, but of thise ilke tweye,
> To whom this tale sucre be or soot,
> Though that I tarie a yeer, *som-tyme I moot*
> *After myn auctor tellen hir gladnesse,*
> *As wel as I have told hir hevinesse* (iii, 1193–1197).

The " hevinesse " of the lovers (iii, 1197) is described and narrated,
with a wealth of vivid detail in iii, 792–1183, and this passage of nearly
400 lines does not come from Boccaccio, even in the most general
way.[1] The " gladnesse " of the lovers (iii, 1196) is described and
narrated, with a wealth of vivid detail, in iii, 1198–1414, and of this
passage of about 200 lines only about a third is taken from the *Filo-*

---

[1] The parallels between the *Troilus* and the *Filocolo* quoted by Young, pp. 143 ff.,
may be accepted without affecting my argument here.

strato. Yet Chaucer declares with emphasis in iii, 1193–97, which looks before and after, forming a transition from one of these highly original passages to the other, that he has followed his *auctor* in the first and means to follow him likewise in the second, — indeed that he *must* follow him if he is to tell the story. Nowhere in the poem are his disclaimers and his protestation of faithfulness to his *auctor* more striking. Indeed, in iii, 1198, after he has proceeded to the extent of just one verse in the " gladnesse " scene, he reiterates his profession of fidelity in the words, " As written clerkes [1] in hir bokes olde":

> Criseyde, which that felte hir thus ytake,
> *As writen clerkes in hir bokes olde,*
> Right as an aspes leef she gan to quake (iii, 1197–1199).

The only clerk who ever wrote this in his old book was Geoffrey Chaucer himself. But he is not yet content with the emphasis that he has laid upon his faithfulness to Lollius. In iii, 1321–1330, he actually interrupts his account of the lovers' "gladnesse" to cite his *auctor* and protest fidelity again:

> Awey, thou foule daunger and thou fere,
> And lat hem in this hevene blisse dwelle,
> That is so heygh, that al ne can I telle!
>
> But sooth is, though I can not tellen al,
> As can myn auctor, of his excellence,
> Yet have I seyd (and god to-forn) and shal
> In every thing al hoolly his sentence;
> And if that I, at loves reverence,
> Have any word in-eched for the beste,
> Doth therewith-al right as your-selven leste (iii, 1321–1330).

" Tellen al " in v. 1324 applies (like the same phrase in v. 1323) to the details of " this hevene blisse." The meaning is unmistakable. " My *auctor*," the poet avers, " gives complete details of the lovers' happiness, but I am unable to reproduce them in full, for I have not his ability; [2] yet so far in this description, I have reproduced his meaning at every point, condensing more or less, and only now and then insert-

---

[1] *Clerkes* with their *bokes olde* is manifestly a mere variation of *myn auctor* (three lines before); but if we choose to take it in the sense of " myn auctor and others," no harm is done.

[2] Cf. ii, 8–21, 1219–1220; iii, 39–48; iv, 799–805; v, 1769.

ing a word. And in the rest of the scene I shall do likewise."[1] The plain truth is very different from Chaucer's artistic fiction: — in that portion of the " gladnesse " scene which immediately precedes — about 125 verses (iii, 1198–1320) — he has been almost completely original, borrowing only a dozen lines or so from Boccaccio, and in the rest of this scene (iii, 1338–1414) he expands Boccaccio by about twenty per cent. The whole of the " gladnesse " scene, as I have already noted (iii, 1198–1414), is only about one-third Boccaccio's, and the scene of " hevinesse " (iii, 792–1183) — ascribed to " myn auctor " with equal emphasis — is not in Boccaccio at all.

Here it may be well to consider the Visit to Pandarus as a whole (iii, 512–1582). The narrative is suggested, no doubt, by Boccaccio's account of Troilus' visit to Cressida,[2] but Chaucer has cut loose from

---

[1] The reference here is not to a general procedure throughout the poem, but to procedure in this scene. The apologetic words of the poet interrupt his account of the lovers' transports, which is resumed at 1338. Chaucer's disclaimer in iii, 1322–1325 is adapted from two passages in the *Filostrato:*

> Lungo sarebbe a raccontar la festa,
> E impossibile a dire il diletto
> Che insieme preser pervenuti in questa (iii, 31);

> O dolce notte, e molto disiata,
> Chente fostu alli due lieti amanti!
> Se la scienza mi fosse donata
> Che ebbero i poeti tutti quanti,
> Per me non potrebbe esser disegnata! (iii, 33).

It is immensely significant with reference to Chaucer's Lollian fiction that, whereas Boccaccio remarks that even if he had " all the skill of all the poets " he could not do justice to the subject, Chaucer, in adapting the passage, declares that his *auctor* was fully competent and gave a complete and detailed account, but that he [the translator] cannot reproduce all these details, for lack of skill.

Of course Chaucer knew that he had been expanding enormously in this scene, and this knowledge doubtless added zest to his remark (appended to his profession of condensing or omitting) that he might have put in a word here and there to make the translation clearer (" have any word in-eched for the beste "). This would inevitably be understood by any one who was taken in by Chaucer's pretence of translating from Lollius as referring merely to such occasional insertions of a word or two as are necessary in translating from Latin prose or verse into English rhymes.

[2] *Filostrato*, iii, 21–55. Some details appear to have been suggested by the *Filocolo* (see Young, pp. 139 ff.).

the *Filostrato* and written, as all admit, a highly original episode, utilizing only such material in the Italian as suited his purpose. Boccaccio's account occupies less than 300 verses; Chaucer's narrative extends to more than a thousand. Yet Chaucer not only cites his *auctor* just before the episode (iii, 502), but also, in the course of the episode itself, makes several professions (express or implied) that he is faithfully following that *auctor* to the best of his ability, and contracting rather than expanding (iii, 575–581, 967–973, 1193–1199, 1323–1330, 1369–1372). There is one more suggestion of condensing in the very last part of the episode (iii, 1576), though the particular incident (1555–1582) does not occur in Boccaccio at all. This state of things would be enough to prove the impossibility of seriously equating Lollius with Boccaccio rather than with *himself, Lollius*, the alleged source of practically everything in the poem.[1]

Book iii closes after some 200 more verses, about half of them from Boccaccio, but it does not close without a sweeping assertion from

---

[1] I pass over iii, 1774–1775, since here Chaucer is merely appealing to books in general — i.e., the authorities on Trojan history — for the detail that Troilus was second only to Hector in prowess. Most of the stanza, including the phrase in question (" se non erra La storia ") comes from the *Filostrato* (iii, 90), but this particular detail is not found there. The celebration of Troilus as next to Hector in prowess occurs five times in Chaucer's poem:

    1. The wyse worthy Ector the secounde (ii, 158).
    2. For out and out he is the worthieste
       Save only Ector, which that is the beste (ii, 739–740).
    3. And certeynly, but-if that bokes erre,
       Save Ector most ydrad of any wight (iii, 1774–1775).
    4. For whom [i.e. Hector] as olde bokes tellen us,
       Was mad swich wo that tonge it may not telle, —
       And namely the sorwe of Troilus,
       That next him was of worthinesse welle (v, 1562–1565).
    5. As he that was withouten any pere,
       Save Ector, in his tyme, as I can here (v, 1803–1804).

Passages 1, 2, and 5 are not in Boccaccio; 3 has just been discussed. The mourning for Hector is mentioned in the *Filostrato* (viii, 1) as well as in Benoit (16317 ff. Constans, 16265 ff. Joly) and Guido (ed. 1489, sig. i. 4, fol. 3), but the rank of Troilus as second to Hector is not specified in that context by any one of the three. The detail is well covered by both Benoit and Guido elsewhere; still, the particular phrase " Ector the secounde " certainly seems to come from Guido: " alius Hector vel secundus ab ipso " (sig. e 2 v°): see Hamilton, p. 76; Young, pp. 108–111.

Chaucer of fidelity to his *auctor:* — " Thanks and praise to thee, O
Lady Venus, and to thy son Cupid, and to you, O Muses!

> " That ye thus far han deyned me to gyde,
> I can not more but (syn that ye wol wende) —
> Ye heried been for ay withouten ende!

> " Thourgh yow have I said fully in my song
> The effect and ioye of Troilus servyse
> (Al be that ther was som disese among)
> *As to myn auctor listeth to devise.*
> My thridde book now ende I in this wyse —
> And Troilus in lust and in quiete
> Is with Criseyde, his owne herte swete " (iii, 1811–1820).

The beginning of Book iv is continuous with the end of Book iii:

> But al to litel, weylawey the whyle!
> Lasteth swich ioye — ythanked be Fortune,
> That semeth trewest whan she wol begyle,
> And can to foles so hir song entune
> That she hem hent and blent, traytour comune!
> And whan a wight is from hir wheel ythrowe,
> Than laugheth she and maketh him the mowe.

> From Troilus she gan hir brighte face
> Awey to wrythe, and took of him non hede,
> But caste him clene out of his lady grace,
> And on hir wheel she sette up Diomede;
> For which right now myn herte ginneth blede,
> And now my penne, allas! with which I wryte,
> Quaketh for drede of that I moot endyte.

> For how Criseyde Troilus forsook,
> Or at the leste, how that she was unkinde,
> Mot hennes-forth ben matere of my book,
> *As wryten folk thorugh which it is in minde.*
> Allas! that they should ever cause finde
> To speke hir harm; and if they on hir lye,
> Y-wis, hem-self sholde han the vilanye (iv, 1–21).

The plural in the last four lines does not suggest any purpose to for-
sake " myn auctor Lollius," but — if it must be taken literally, and
not as a mere variant — merely implies that Lollius is here supported
by other authorities. The whole passage (iii, 1811–iv, 21) would
assuredly confirm the impression (already fixed in the reader's mind

by much protesting) that Chaucer has followed his one *auctor* closely
and intends to follow him closely to the end, never departing from him
without due notice.

References or allusions to a source are not common in Book iv; but
there are enough of them to keep alive the reader's impression that
Chaucer is faithful to his single *auctor*. In iv, 36–42, we have another
example of a device already treated:[1] — avowed ignorance of some
detail *plus* avowed knowledge of something else. " I do not know how
long the interval was, but — the day of battle came," etc. This
amounts to alleging that " myn auctor does not define the interval
but *does* narrate *ut sequitur*." Here, so it happens, the reference is
true to Boccaccio.[2]

In iv, 799–805, however, we have a curious piece of Lollian mystifi-
cation.

> How mighte it ever yred ben or ysonge,
> The pleynte that she made in hir distresse?
> I noot; but, as for me, my litel tonge,
> If I discreven wolde hir hevinesse,
> It sholde make hir sorwe seme lesse
> Than that it was, and childishly deface
> Hir heigh compleynte, and therefore I it pace.

Chaucer would have us believe that his original afforded a fuller
account of Cressida's lament, which he is unable to reproduce because
of his feeble powers: that is, he exalts his *auctor* at his own expense
and pretends to summarize or omit.[3] In fact, however, he gives
Cressida's complaint at almost exactly the same length which it has
in Boccaccio,[4] and even his disclaimer is a kind of translation, empha-
sized so as to accord with his regular pose of lack of wit:[5]

> Chi potrebbe giammai narrare a pieno
> Ciò che Criseida nel pianto dicea?
> Certo non io, che al fatto il dir vien meno,
> Tant' era la sua noia cruda e rea (iv, 95).

Here, then, Chaucer uses the very words of Boccaccio to produce the
effect of condensing Lollius at a time when, in fact, he is following

---

[1] P. 97, above.   [2] *Filostrato*, iv, 1–2.
[3] We have observed the same device in iii, 1321–1330 (p. 99, above).
[4] *Filocolo*, iv, 88–94.   [5] Cf. p. 99, note 2, above.

Boccaccio without condensation. Lollius, therefore, is not Boccaccio, any more than Chaucer himself becomes identical with Boccaccio by using " I " where the Italian uses " io."

Stanza 203 of this Fourth Book (1415–1421) may perhaps be dismissed as ambiguous evidence. " As writen wel I fynde " (1415) would naturally mean " as I find in Lollius," and then " Thus writen they that of hir werkes knewe " (1421) would be either a loose generalizing plural for " myn auctor," or a real defining plural equivalent to " myn auctor " and other writers. The detail concerned is Cressida's honest purpose and her genuine sorrow at parting, and we have the same assertion of her grief, with a similar plural reference, in v, 15–21 (" as men in bokes rede "). Both Boccaccio [1] and Benoit [2] do, in fact, emphasize this point. Clearly, however, the occasional use of a plural like *bokes* or *they* amounts at most only to the occasional citation of subsidiary authorities to corroborate Lollius, and has a tendency rather to establish than to shaken the reader's faith in Chaucer's carefully fostered fiction that he is a conscientious translator from the Latin of that vanished ancient. This fiction, therefore, is still maintained at the beginning of Book v.

And so we arrive at the highly felictious incident of Diomede's flirtation *en route* (v, 92–189). This incident was suggested by Benoit; [3] there is not a touch of it in Boccaccio. Yet Chaucer gives no hint that he is here departing from his *auctor*, and the reader has therefore every reason to infer that the episode in question is Lollian. Immediately after the wooing, Chaucer begins to follow Boccaccio again (at v, 190) and keeps reasonably close to him, though indulging in considerable freedom, until we reach the next indication of source (v, 799). From 92 to 799, then, there is no indication on the poet's part that he is indebted to anybody but Lollius. Yet in 92–189 his source (so far as he is not original) is Benoit, while in 190–798 his source (so far as he is not original) is Boccaccio. It is idle, then, to assert that Lollius is Boccaccio unless one is willing to admit that Boccaccio is Benoit!

---

[1] *Filostrato*, v, 1 and 6–7.

[2] 13495 ff. Constans (13469 ff. Joly). Guido, on the contrary, apostrophizes Troilus in a very different spirit: " Sed, o Troile, quae te tam iuuenilis errare coegit credulitas vt Briseide lacrimis crederes deceptiuis et eius blandiciis ? " and he proceeds to lampoon the whole sex (ed. 1489, sig. i 2).

[3] 13529–13702 Constans (13499–13666 Joly).

The celebrated set of portraits or characters — Diomede, Cressida, Troilus — in v, 799–840, is a digression, and has a somewhat complicated genesis.[1] The passage contains four indications of source. The first, " as bokes us declare " (799), though applying (if strictly taken) to Diomede's portrait alone, may well enough be regarded as introducing the whole set. If so, the " bokes " would naturally be understood by the reader (as in the case of the plurals just discussed) to mean " my auctor Lollius and other authorities." The effect of having consulted more books than one at this point is enhanced by " and som men seyn " (804) and by " they writen that hire syen " (816). As for " in storie it is yfounde " (834), that means only " as history tells us," and thus ranges with the plural ascriptions that precede, since all educated persons in the fourteenth century knew that there were several extant accounts of the Trojan War. There is no hint that the subsidiary authorities are inconsistent with Lollius in the points here discussed. They are, we are to infer, either confirmatory or supplementary. The Lollian fiction remains, then, in full force.

In the account of Diomede's successful pressing of his suit (v, 841–1036), Chaucer four times pretends to be condensing: — " At shorte wordes for to telle " (848); " What sholde I telle his wordes that he seide? " (946); " But in effect, and shortly for to seye " (1009); " And shortly, lest that ye my tale breke " (1032). In fact, he is following Boccaccio (vi, 9–34) with a fair degree of closeness, *but not really condensing him;* for Boccaccio has 208 verses, Chaucer has 196. I do not wish to press the point, however, and am quite willing to allow this passage to stand to the credit of the much battered formula *Lollius = Boccaccio.*

What follows immediately, however, is of much significance on the other side. I must quote v, 1037–1057:

> And after this *the story telleth us*
> That she him yaf the faire baye stede
> The which she ones wan of Troilus;
> And eek a broche (and that was litle nede)   1040
> That Troilus was she yaf this Diomede;

---

[1] The sources are Boccaccio and (mediately or immediately, or both) the portraits drawn by Dares (cap. 12), as well as the epic of Josephus Iscanus (who also drew from Dares). That Joseph was used by Chaucer has been revealed by Root, whose paper in *Modern Philology* is eagerly awaited (see the references in Cummings, p. 80).

And eek, the bet from sorwe him to releve,
She made him were a pencel of hir sleve.

I finde eek in the stories elleswhere,
Whan through the body hurt was Diomede,   1045
Of Troilus, tho weep she many a tere
Whan that she saugh his wyde woundes blede,
And that she took to kepen him good hede;
And, for to hele him of his sorwes smerte,
Men seyn (I noot) that she yaf him hir herte.   1050

But trewely, *the story telleth us,*
Ther made never womman more wo
Than she, whan that she falsed Troilus.
She seyde, Alas! for now is clene a-go
My name of trouthe in love, for ever-mo!   1055
For I have falsed oon the gentileste
That ever was, and oon the worthieste!

" The story " in 1037 is of course " myn auctor Lollius," and equally of course, it is the same *auctor* (Chaucer means to imply) that he has followed in the account just preceding (841–1036).   Now the facts are (1) that 841–1036 are mainly (though not exclusively) from Boccaccio, as we have seen; (2) that the steed is from Benoit;[1] (3) that the brooch is from Boccaccio;[2] and (4) that the " pencel " is from Benoit.[3] If Boccaccio is Lollius, then, Benoit is Lollius by the same token, and once more we have proved that Boccaccio is Benoit!

But to continue. " In the stories elsewhere " (1044) either implies a departure from the source that Chaucer has been following in the first stanza or it does not. If it does imply such a departure, it is a misstatement, for the incident reported is from Benoit;[4] if it does not imply such a departure, then it means " elsewhere in Lollius." On either alternative, the equation *Boccaccio = Lollius* is excluded.

At all events, " the story " in 1051 manifestly means the same history that is cited in 1037, — that is, Lollius. Yet what follows in 1052–1085 is not from Boccaccio but from Benoit,[5] with Chaucer's own additions.[6]

[1] 14286–14324, 15114–15115 Constans (14238–14276, 15046–15047 Joly).
[2] *Filostrato*, viii, 9–10; cf. *Troilus*, v, 1660–1666.
[3] 15176–15178 Constans (15104 ff., Joly).
[4] 20202 ff. Constans (20193–20,274 Joly).
[5] 20229–20317 Constans (20221–20308, Joly).
[6] Stanzas 156–157 (v, 1086–1099) throw no light on the Lollian fiction. " Non

With 1100 Chaucer returns to Troilus, and the reader naturally supposes (as Chaucer intends him to suppose) that the same source is to be followed as heretofore — Lollius, just referred to as " the story " in 1051. This impression will naturally extend to whatever is narrated until there is a further express indication of source,[1] — that is, it will cover the contents of 1100–1650, — up to 1651, where " the storie " is once more cited. Lollius, then, is responsible for the contents of 1100–1650. These, briefly analyzed, are —

(1) 1100–1456, mostly from Boccaccio;
(2) 1457–1512, from Ovid and the *Thebaid;*
(3) 1513–1534, from Boccaccio, with additions;
(4) 1535–1561, original and from Benoit;
(5) 1562–1589, mostly from Boccaccio;
(6) 1590–1631, Cressida's letter, original;
(7) 1632–1650, from Boccaccio.

Thus Lollius becomes a somewhat complicated worthy. Yet he it is whom Chaucer means us to accept as the source of this mosaic (v, 1100–1650), and his intention, clear enough already, is emphasized by another reference to " the storie " at this point (1651). It will be best to quote three stanzas:

> Stood on a day in his melencolye
> This Troilus, and in suspecioun
> Of hir for whom he wende for to dye.
> And so bifel, that through-out Troye toun,
> As was the gyse, y-bore was up and doun   1650
> A maner cote-armure, *as seyth the storie,*
> Biforn Deiphebe, in signe of his victorie,

auctor " (1088) means " neither Lollius (my authority in this work) nor any other writer whom I have consulted on this point." " The story " in 1094 may mean either Lollius or " the history in general " (i. e., the Trojan story). All the authorities (Benoit, Guido, and Boccaccio) blame Cressida. Thus these verses are ambiguous evidence in our discussion.

[1] The " olde bokes " mentioned in v, 1562–1565, as testifying to the lamentation for Hector count on neither side in our discussion. The reference is merely casual and vouches for an incidental detail. It suggests no turning aside from the main line of translation. The detail, anyhow, is found in all three authorities — Boccaccio (*Filostrato,* viii, 1; *Teseide,* xi, 7), Benoit, and Guido. " Olde stories " in v, 1459, and " olde bokes " in 1478 and 1481, are ascriptions by Cassandra and do not count. Cf. Pandarus' " bokes twelve " for the *Thebaid* (ii, 108), and Troilus' " as men in bokes rede " (iii, 1429).

> The whiche cote, *as telleth Lollius*,
> Deiphebe it hadde y-rent from Diomede
> The same day; and whan this Troilus   1655
> It saugh, he gan to taken of it hede,
> Avysing of the length and of the brede,
> And al the werk; but as he gan biholde,
> Ful sodeinly his herte gan to colde,

> As he that on the coler fond with-inne   1660
> A broche, that he Criseyde yaf that morwe
> That she from Troye moste nedes twinne,
> In remembraunce of him and of his sorwe;
> And she him leyde ayein hir feyth to borwe
> To kepe it ay; but now, ful wel he wiste,   1665
> His lady nas no longer on to triste (v, 1646–1666).

By " the storie " in 1651 Chaucer means the reader to understand the same authority mentioned (in the same terms) in 1037 and 1051. But, since he has not called him by name for a good while, and since the poem is drawing to a close, he adds " as telleth Lollius," and thus fixes his *auctor* in our minds forever.

It is quite true that the detail of the coat-armor is found in Boccaccio, and in Boccaccio alone.[1] But Chaucer's manifest purpose here is not simply to credit Lollius with a particular detail, but likewise to recall the name itself to our minds as that of the *auctor* whom he has consistently pretended to follow from the outset. This fiction of fidelity to Lollius is in no wise weakened or contravened by the few instances in which Chaucer suggests that he has consulted other old writers. For in these instances, as we have seen, the other ancients either agree with Lollius (such is the fiction intended) or supplement him in some incidental matter. Anyhow, the total amount of material thus alleged as supplementary is a mere nothing — and the fiction of fidelity to Lollius gains rather than loses in verisimilitude by such references. For we naturally infer, as I have said before, that Lollius is never abandoned, even for a moment, without due notice.

And so it results from our examination of the numerous passages in which Chaucer thus far refers or alludes to his *auctor*, — there are nearly 40 of them, or an average of one for every 200 lines — that Lollius stands for the source not merely of what Chaucer has actually

---

[1] *Filostrato*, viii, 8–10.

taken from Boccaccio, but, with a few minute exceptions, for what he has actually taken from Benoit and Statius and Guillaume de Machaut and Boëthius and Ovid and — more important still — what he has derived from his own imagination. Lollius is nobody but Lollius — a real personage (as Chaucer thought) from whom, in a fiction, he pretends to translate his poem.

There is nothing in the 200 lines that remain (v, 1667–1869) that modifies these pregnant and unforced conclusions.[1] Two places, however, need citation. First, in v, 1765–1771, Chaucer reverts to the distinction he made at the very beginning (i, 141–147) and points out the difference between his matter (i.e., the material that he has found in the lost author Lollius) and the well-known tale of Troy as recorded by Dares. This distinction helps, of course, to maintain the fiction of a Lollian source, a long-lost manuscript discovered by Chaucer when the stars were propitious. Second, in 1854–1855 he seems to imply that Lollius wrote in verse, like " Virgil, Ovide, Omer, Lucan, and Stace " :

> Lo here the forme of olde clerkes speche
> In poetrye, if ye hir bokes seche!

This point, however, may be waived. At all events, Chaucer has informed us unequivocally that Lollius wrote his Troilus story in Latin (ii, 14), and that alone is enough to show that Chaucer did not mean him to be Boccaccio.

---

[1] " I finde " (v, 1758), following " As men may in thes olde bokes rede " (1753), means apparently, " I find in these old books." The whole passage (1751–1764) is true to Boccaccio (*Filostrato*, viii, 25–26) and may be counted, if one wishes, in favor of the equation so often referred to; but it does not disturb the impression that Chaucer's consistently followed source is Lollius, and that impression disproves the equation. " Other bokes " in 1776, and " as I can here " in 1804 prove nothing either way.

APPENDIX II

Use of the Teseide in the Troilus

Three stanzas of the *Troilus* (v, 1807–1827) have long been recognized as an almost·literal translation from the *Teseide* (xi, 1–3). The following imitation, almost equally literal, has not been noted:[1]

> On hevene yet the sterres were sene,
> Although ful pale ywoxen was the mone,
> And whyten gan the orisonte shene
> Al estward, as it woned is to done;
> And Phebus with his rosy carte sone
> Gan after that to dresse him up to fare,
> Whan Troilus hath sent after Pandare (v, 274–280).

> Il ciel tutte le stelle ancor mostrava,
> Benchè Febea già palida fosse;
> E l'orizzonte tutto biancheggiava
> Nell' orïente, e eransi già mosse
> L'Ore, e col carro, in cui la luce stava,
> Giungevano i cavai, vedendo rosse
> Le membra del celeste bue levato,
> Dall' amica Titonia accompagnato (vii, 94).

Only three stanzas after this striking imitation comes another passage in which Chaucer certainly remembered the *Teseide*. It is the beautiful address of Troilus to his friend in expectation of death, and the deathbed of Arcita is what was in the poet's mind. Troilus sends for Pandarus as Arcita for Palemone[2] and confides to him his last wishes. He speaks of " the fyr and flaumbe funeral " that is to consume his body,[3] of "the pleyes palestral" (a phrase[4] which Chaucer

---

[1] Dr. B. A. Wise (*The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer*, p. 21) compares *Thebaid*, xii, 1–4, which may well be the original of Boccaccio's verses, but Chaucer was rendering Boccaccio here.

[2] *Troilus*, v, 280; *Teseide*, x, 37. This line of the Troilus closes the stanza just noted as almost literally rendered from *Teseide*, vii, 94, and the speech of Troilus begins after two stanzas of transition.

[3] v, 302–303; cf. *Teside*, xi, 13–14.

[4] *Troilus*, v, 304: cf. *Teseide*, vii, 4 (" un palestral giuoco "), 27 (" mio palestral giuoco "); Theseus, to honor the dead Arcita, contends " nell' unta palestra " at

got from the *Teseide*). and requests that his steed may be offered to Mars and his arms to Pallas.[1]

His final request relates to his ashes:

> The poudre in which myn herte ybrend shal torne,
> That preye I thee thou take and it conserve
> In a vessel that men clepth an urne,
> Of gold, and to my lady that I serve,
> For love of whom thus pitously I sterve,
> So yeve it hir, and do me this plesaunce,
> To preye hir kepe it for a remembraunce (v, 309–315).

> Egeo vi ritornò il dì seguente,
> E con pietosa man tutte raccolse
> Le ceneri da capo prima spente
> Con molto vino, e di terra le tolse,
> Ed in un' urna d'oro umilemente
> Le mise, e quella in cari drappi involse,
> E nel tempio di Marte fe' guardare
> Fin ch'altro loco le potesse dare (xi, 58).[2]

Palemone has a temple built,

> Ed in quel volle che 'l cener guardato
> Fosse d'Arcita, in eterna memoria
> Del suo valore e della sua vittoria (xi, 69).

In the midst of the temple was set up a column,

> sopra la qual d'oro lucente
> Un' urna fu discretamente sita:
> Dentro la qual la cenere tepente
> Fece servare del suo amico Arcita (xi, 90).[3]

Troilus ends with a prayer to Mercury:

> And, god Mercurie, of me now, woful wrecche,
> The soule gyde, and whan thee list it fecche! (v, 321–322).

the " giuochi " (xi, 59, 62). *Teseide*, xi, 62, is cited by Young, *The Origin and Development of the Story of Troilus and Creseyde*, p. 177 (see Skeat on *Troilus*, v, 304). Cf. Wise, *The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer*, pp. 21–22.

[1] v, 306–308; cf. *Teseide*, xi, 35, 52, 55–56 (see Skeat on *Troilus*, v, 306).

[2] This comparison is made by Young, pp. 177–178 (cf. Wise, pp. 21–22; Cummings, p. 79).

[3] Cf. the argument of *Teseide*, xi; also (for urns), ii, 74, 81 (called *vaselli* in ii, 83).

This is a plain reminiscence of Arcita's prayer to the same god,[1] as well of his wish for sacrifice to be made to him: —

> Amici cari, io me ne vo dicerto,
> Perch' io vorrei a Mercurio litare,
> Acciò che esso, per sì fatto merto,
> In luogo ameno piacciagli portare
> Lo spirto mio (x, 89).

The inscription on Arcita's urn, in which the urn itself is made to speak the epitaph, is justly admired by every reader:

> Io servo dentro a me le reverende
> Del buon Arcita ceneri, per cui
> Debito sagrificio qui si rende.
> E chiunque ama, per esempio lui
> Pigli, se amor di soverchio l' accende:
> Perocchè dicer può: qual se' io fui,
> E per Emilia usando il mio valore
> Morii: dunque ti guarda da Amore (xi, 91).

Chaucer remembered this epitaph when he wrote the very different stanza, still more beautiful, in which Troilus addresses those lovers in future days who shall pass by his tomb:

> O ye lovers that heigh upon the wheel
> Ben set of Fortune in good aventure,
> God leve that ye finde ay love of steel,
> And longe mot your lyf in ioye endure!
> But whan ye comen by my sepulture,
> Remembreth that your felawe resteth there;
> For I lovede eek, though I unworthy were (iv, 323–329).

Chaucer's use of the *Teseide* in the *Troilus*, proved by the foregoing examples, seems to have begun in his First Book. It appears to be discernible in the quotation that Pandarus makes from Oenone's letter:

> " Phebus, that first fond art of medicyne,"
> Quod she, " and coude in every wightes care
> Remede and reed, by herbes he knew fyne,
> Yet to him-self his conninge was ful bare;
> For love hadde him so bounden in a snare,
> Al for the doughter of the kinge Admete,
> That al his craft ne coude his sorwe bete " (i, 659–665).

[1] *Teseide*, x, 93–98.

This, as Skeat remarks, is "not at all a literal translation" of *Hero-
ides*, v, 149–152, though it "gives the general sense."

> Quaecumque herba potens ad opem radixque medendi
>   Utilis in toto nascitur orbe, mea est.
> Me miseram, quod amor non est medicabilis herbis!
>   Deficior prudens artis ab arte mea.
> Ipse repertor opis vaccas pavisse Pheraeas
>   Fertur et e nostro saucius igne fuit.
> Quod nec graminibus tellus fecunda creandis
>   Nec deus, auxilium tu mihi ferre potes (v, 147–154).

The words of Palemone in *Teseide*, iii, 25, may have influenced Chaucer
here:

> O quanto ne sarieno a tal fedita
> Gli argomenti esculapii buoni e sani,
> Il qual dicien che tornerebbe in vita
> Con erbe i lacerati corpi umani!
> Ma che dich' io?   *Poichè Apollo, sentita*
> *Cotal saetta, che i succhi mondani*
> *Tutti conobbe, non seppe vedere*
> *Medela a sè che potesse valere.*

Cf. *Teseide*, iv, 46 (Arcita's words this time, in a prayer to Apollo):

> Siccome *te alcuna volta Amore*
> *Costrinse il chiaro cielo abbandonare,*
> *E lungo Anfriso in forma di pastore*
> *Del grande Admeto gli armenti guardare,*[1]
> Così or me il possente signore
> Qui in Atene ha fatto ritornare,
> Contra al mandato che mi fe' Teseo
> Allora ch'a Peritoo mi rendeo.

In Book ii, it is worth while to compare verses 50–56 with three
beautiful stanzas in the *Teseide*.

> In May, that mother is of monthes glade,
> That fresshe flowers, blewe and whyte and rede,
> Ben quike agayn, that winter dede made,
> And ful of bawme is fletinge every mede;
> When Phebus doth his brighte bemes sprede
> Right in the whyte Bole, it so bitidde
> As I shal singe, on Mayes day the thridde (ii, 50–56).

---

[1] See also *Teseide*, vi, 55; x, 13, 25.

> *Febo, salendo con li suoi cavalli,*
> *Del ciel teneva l' umile animale*
> *Che Europa portò* senza intervalli
> Là dove il nome suo dimora avale;
> E con lui insieme grazïosi stalli
> Venus facea de' passi con che sale:
> Perchè rideva il cielo tutto quanto
> D'Amon che 'n pesce dimorava intanto.
>
> Da questa lieta vista delle stelle
> Prendea la terra grazïosi effetti,
> E rivestiva le sue parti belle
> Di nuove erbette e di vaghi fioretti;
> E le sue braccia le piante novelle
> Avean di fronde rivestite, e stretti
> Eran dal tempo gli alberi a fiorire
> Ed a far frutto, e 'l mondo rimbellire.
>
> E gli uccelletti ancora i loro amori
> Incominciato avien tutti a cantare,
> Giulivi e gai nelle fronde e fiori;
> E gli animali nol potean celare,
> Anzi 'l mostravan con sembianti fuori;
> E' giovinetti lieti, che ad amare
> Eran disposti, sentivan nel core
> Fervente più che mai crescere amore (iii, 5–7).

One is also reminded of the opening verses of *The Canterbury Tales*.[1] *Troilus*, ii, 64–71, has a certain resemblance to *Teseide*, iv, 73:

> The swalwe Proigne with a sorwful lay,
> Whan morwe com, gan make hir weymentinge,
> Why she forshapen was; and ever lay
> Pandare abedde, half in a slomeringe,
> Til she so neigh him made hir chiteringe,
> How Tereus gan forth hir suster take,
> That with the noyse of hir he gan awake,
> And gan to calle and dresse him up to ryse (ii, 64–71).
>
> Allor sentendo cantar Filomena,
> Che si fa lieta del morto Tereo,
> Si drizza (iv, 73).[2]

---

[1] Where Skeat well compares Guido, bk. iv (opening passage), ed. 1489, sig. d 2. Cf. also Petrarch, Sonnet 8 *in Vita*.

[2] Cited by Cummings, p. 54. Koeppel, *Anglia*, XIII, 184, compares *Purga-*

The following stanza in Pandarus' description of the prowess of Troilus (not in the *Filostrato*) appears to owe something to the *Teseide:*

> Now here, now there, he hunted hem so faste,
> There nas but Grekes blood and Troilus:
> Now hem he hurte, and hem alle doun he caste.
> Ay where he went it was arrayed thus:
> He was hir deeth, and sheld and lyf for us;
> That as that day ther dorste noon withstonde,
> Whyl that he held his blody swerde in honde (ii, 197–203).

> Esso ferì tra la gente più folta,
> E colla spada si fece far via;
> E questo qua, e quello là rivolta,
> Costui abbatte, e quell' altro feria:
> E combattendo dimostra la molta
> Prodezza che Amor nel cor gli cria:
> E' non ne giva nullo rispiarmando
> Ma come fulgor tutti spaventando (viii, 81).

Dr. Cummings (p. 55) compares —

> O cruel god, O dispitouse Marte,
> O Furies three of helle, on yow I crye! (ii, 435–436).

with

> O fiero Marte, o dispettoso iddio (i, 58); [1]
> Marte nella sua fredda regione
> Colle sue furie insieme s'è tornato (iii, 1).

In *Troilus*, iii, 720–721, Venus is adjured to be favorable —

> For love of him thou lovedest in the shawe,
> I mene Adoon, that with the boor was slawe.

This may possibly have been suggested by *Teseide*, vii, 43:

> O bella Dea del buon Vulcano sposa,
> Per cui s'allegra il monte Citerone,

torio, ix, 13–15. I compare *Anth. Pal.*, v, 237. Wise, p. 63, declares that Petrarch's 42d sonnet (*in Morte*) is the source of *Troilus*, " ii, 50 f. and 64 f.":

> Zefiro torna, e'l bel tempo rimena
> Ei fiori e l'erbe, sua dolce famiglia,
> E garrir Progne, e pianger Filomena,
> E primavera candida e vermiglia.

[1] Wise, p. 62. In *Troilus*, iv, 22–24, it is impossible to doubt that Chaucer remembered Dante, *Inferno*, ix, 45 ff.

> Deh, i' ti prego che mi sii pietosa
> Per quello amor che portasti ad Adone.[1]

At all events, Chaucer thought well enough of the passage to translate it pretty literally in the *Knight's Tale*, A, 2221–2225:

> Fairest of faire, o lady myn, Venus,
> Doughter of Iove and spouse of Vulcanus,
> Thou glader of the mount of Citheroun,
> For thilke love thou haddest to Adoun,
> Have pitee of my bittre teres smerte.

Chaucer's confusion of Tithonus with "the sonne Tytan" in *Troilus*, iii, 1464–1470, may be due to Boccaccio's form *Titon* for Tithonus in *Teseide*, iv. 72:

> E sempre si svegliava allora
> Che de Titon partita vien l' Aurora.[2]

Skeat compares *Heroides*, xviii, 111–112, but omits 114, which is very pertinent; " Et querimur parvas noctibus esse moras." We should certainly add *Amores*, i, 13, which not only concerns Tithonus and Aurora but contains the original of certain lines in Troilus' address to Night:

> Wel oughte bestes pleyne and folk thee chyde
> That, ther-as day with labour wolde us breste,
> That thou thus fleest, and deynest us nought reste! (iii, 1433–1435).

Cf. *Amores*, i, 13, 17ff., and in particular:

> Prima bidente vides oneratos arva colentes,
> Prima vocas tardos sub iuga panda boves (11–12).

Troilus, v, 8–12, is manifestly a close translation from the *Teseide:*

> The golden-tressed Phebus heighe on-lofte
> Thryes hadde al with his bemes shene
> The snowes molte, and Zephirus as ofte
> Ybrought ayein the tendre leves grene
> Sin, etc.

---

[1] Cf. *Teseide*, vi, 42:

> Nè crede alcun che sì bel fosse Adone
> Di Cinira, da Vener tanto amato.

[2] Cummings, p. 70. Cf., however, *Purgatorio*, ix, 1–3; Petrarch, Sonnet 23 (*in Morte*).

> Il sole avea due volte dissolute
> Le nevi agli alti poggi, ed altrettante
> Zefiro aveva le frondi rendute
> Ed i be' fiori alle spogliate piante,
> Poichè, etc. (ii, 1).[1]

Chaucer's description of Cressida may owe something to Boccaccio's description of Emilia. I will not insist on the resemblance between *Troilus*, v, 809–812, and *Teseide*, xii, 54:

> And ofte-tyme this was hir manere,
> To gon ytressed with hir heres clere
> Doun by hir coler at hir bak bihinde,
> Which with a thred of gold she wolde binde (v, 809–812).

> Dico che li suoi crini parean d'oro,
> Non per treccia ristretti ma soluti,
> E pettinati sì che in fra loro
> Non n' era un torto, e cadean sostenuti
> Sopra li candidi omeri, nè foro
> Prima nè poi si be' giammai veduti:
> Nè altro sopra quelli ella portava
> Ch' una corona ch' assai si stimava (xii, 54).[2]

But his comment that Cressida's joined brows were the only defect in her beauty certainly reminds one of the particularity with which Boccaccio notes that Emilia's eyebrows *were* divided:

> La fronte sua era ampia e spaziosa,
> E bianca e piana e molto dilicata,
> Sotto la quale in volta tortuosa, ·
> Quasi di mezzo cerchio terminata,
> Eran due ciglia più che altra cosa
> Nerissime e sottil, nelle qua' lata
> Bianchezza si videa lor dividendo,
> Nè 'l debito passavan sè estendendo (xii, 55).

Professor Root has discovered that verses 807–826 owe much to Josephus Iscanus, iv, 156–162;[3] but Chaucer could never have unriddled the *joined eyebrows* [4] from Joseph's tangled rhetoric (" Um-

---

[1] Cited by Wise, p. 62, who notes that Boccaccio is imitating *Thebaid*, iv, 1–3, and who compares also *Thebaid*, vii, 223-226. See Rossetti, p. 232.

[2] Hamilton, p. 79, compares *Troilus*, v, 809–812, with *Teseide*, vii, 65, 1–2. See Young, pp. 117–118.

[3] See Cummings, p. 80.

[4] On the eyebrows see Krapp, *Modern Language Notes*, XIX, 235; Hamilton,

braeque minoris Delicias oculus iunctos suspendit in arcus ") unless he had found that detail plainly expressed in Benoit or Guido or Dares.

"They writen that hire syen" (v, 816) suggests the words of Dares ("hos se vidisse," cap. 12), but it may likewise echo Boccaccio's address to the Muses when he is about to describe Emilia's "beauties": — "Voi le vedeste, e so che le sapete" (xii. 52).

We may note that Boccaccio gives a portrait of Palemone in *Teseide*, iii, 49, of Arcita in iii, 50.

The attack on the heathen Gods in *Troilus*, v, 1850, 1852–1853, may owe something to Emilia's blasphemy:

> O dispietati iddii senza mercede,
> Or che è questo che v' è in piacere?
> Dov' è l'amore antico, ove la fede
> Che solevate portare a' mondani?
> Ella n' è gita con li venti vani (xi, 42).

This passage in Chaucer comes only four stanzas after his borrowing of *Teseide*, xi, 1–3 (*Troilus*, v, 1807–1827).

A few trifles (most or all of doubtful validity) may be added: — *Troilus*, ii, 816 (Flexippe), *Teseide*, viii, 43 (Plessippo); *Troilus*, iii 1427–1428, *Teside*, iv, 14 (Wise, pp. 11–12); *Troilus*, iv, 789–790, *Teseide*, x, 94; *Troilus*, iv, 1586 (proverb), *Teseide*, xii, 11; *Troilus*, v, 599–602, *Teseide*, iii, 1 (Wise, p. 23, well compares Dante, *Inferno*, xxx, 1–3).[1]

Troilus, ii, 967–972, closely resembles *Teseide*, ix, 28, but really comes from *Filostrato*, ii, 80. In like manner, *Troilus*, iii, 1310–1318, is closer to *Filostrato*, iii, 31, 33, than to *Teseide*, xii, 76.

The general and particular influence of the *Teseide* on the *Troilus* may be discerned in the use of a number of more or less elaborate astronomical and mythological *definitions of time*. Such things are hardly found in the *Filostrato*.[2] Examples from the *Teseide*[3] are: ii, 1; iii, 5–7, 43; iv, 1; v, 103; vii, 94; ix, 29; x, 1, 88; xii, 64, 81.

in the same journal, XX, 80; Curry, *The Middle English Ideal of Personal Beauty*, pp. 48–49.

[1] Note that Chaucer may well have remembered *Inferno*, xxx, 1–12, when he wrote *Troilus*, iv, 1538–1540.

[2] I have noted only v, 68–69 (*Troilus*, v, 647–648); i, 18 (*Troilus*, i, 155–165) is not the same kind of thing.

[3] Cf. *Ninfale Fiesolano*, iv, 1.

The device took Chaucer's fancy, and he used it freely, not only in the *Troilus* but in his later poetry as well. At least two of the passages from the *Teseide* appear in the *Troilus:* ii, 1 (*Troilus*, v, 8–11), and vii, 94 (*Troilus*, v, 274–279); and iii, 5–7, may have influenced *Troilus*, ii, 50–56 (see p. 113). Other examples from the *Troilus* are: ii, 904–910; iii, 1415–1420; iv, 1590–1593 (cf. v, 1188–1190); v, 1016–1020, 1107–1110; cf. iii, 624–626 (see *C. T.*, A 3514–3521). The following passages in *The Canterbury Tales* illustrate his fondness for this kind of rhetorical adornment: — *Prologue*, 1 ff. (cf. *Teseide*, iii, 5–7; *Troilus*, ii, 50–56); *Knight's Tale*, A 1491–1496; introduction to *Man of Law's Tale*, B 1–15; *Nun's Priest's Tale*, B, 4377–4389; *Merchant's Tale*, E, 1795–1799, 1885–1887, 2219–2224; *Squire's Tale*, F, 47–51, 263–265, 385–387, 671–672; *Franklin's Tale*, F, 1016–1018, 1245–1255; *Parson's Prologue*, I, 1–12.

In some of these examples there is more than a suggestion of the humorous consciousness on Chaucer's part that he is indulging in what Scott called the "big bow-wow style."[1] This comes out in gratifying fashion in *The Franklin's Tale:*

> Til that the brighte sonne loste his hewe,
> For thorisonte hath reft the sonne his light,
> This is as muche to seye as it was night (F 1016–1018).

The same spirit (which some critics mistake for *naïveté*) is discernible in *Troilus*, ii, 904–910:

> The dayes honour and the hevenes yë,[2]
> The nightes fo, — al this clepe I the sonne ! —
> Gan westren faste, and downward for to wrye,
> As he that hadde his dayes cours yronne, etc.

Boccaccio's fondness for such figures in the *Teseide* is due in large part to his admiration for the *Thebaid*, in which they are common. As a specimen we may take a passage which Boccaccio seems to have reworked in the *Teseide*, vii, 94:

> Nondum cuncta polo vigil inclinaverat astra
> Ortus, et instantem cornu tenuiore videbat
> Luna diem, trepidas ubi iam Tithonia nubes
> Discutit ac reduci magnum parat aethera Phoebo (xii, 1–4).[3]

---

[1] Compare B 1–15 with B 4383–4389. [3] Cf. p. 110, above.
[2] "Mundi oculus," Ovid, *Met.*, iv, 228.

Other examples from the *Thebaid* are: — i, 97–99, 336–346, 692–693; ii, 134–140, 527–528; iii, 33–39, 440–441; iv, 1–3, 680–682; v, 85–89, 296–298, 459–460, 476–477; vi, 25–27, 238–241; vii, 470–473; viii, 271–274; x, 1–2; xii, 50–51, 228–229.

No doubt both Boccaccio and Chaucer felt in this matter the influence of Dante, who is notably fond of such figures. See for example, *Inferno*, i, 37–40; *Purgatorio*, i, 19–21;[1] ii, 1–9; ix, 1–9; xv, 1–9; xix, 1–6;[2] xxv, 1–3; xxvii, 1–5; xxx, 1–6; *Paradiso*, xx, 1–6; xxix, 1–6; xxx, 1–9. Cf. also Petrarch Sonnets 8, 20, 28, 168 *in Vita;* Canzone *in Vita;* Sonnet 42 *in Morte.*

[1] The prayer to the Virgin in *Paradiso*, xxxiii, 1 ff., is freely used (as everybody knows) in *The Second Nun's Tale*, G 36 ff. Vv. 13–15 are not there used, but are taken as part of Troilus' address to Love in iii, 1262–1263 (see Skeat; Koeppel, *Anglia*, XIV, 230). "The well-willy planete" in this same address (iii, 1257) reminds one of *Purgatorio*, i, 19 ("Lo bel pianeta che ad amar conforta") — a passage which Chaucer certainly admired, for he uses the next line ("Faceva tutto rider l'oriente") in *The Knight's Tale*, A 1494: "That al the orient laugheth of the light" (Skeat). It is proper to compare also *The Squire's Tale*, F 272–274, with *Purgatorio*, i, 19–21:

> Lo bel pianeta che ad amar conforta
> Faceva tutto rider l'oriente,
> Velando i Pesci ch'erano in sua scorta.

> Now dauncen Venus lusty children dere,
> For in the Fish hir lady sat ful hye
> And loketh on hem with a frendly ye.

[2] This passage may have been in Chaucer's mind when he elaborated *Filostrato*, iii, 42, 1–2, into *Troilus*, iii, 1415–1420.

APPENDIX III

The Teseide and the Thebaid

For reference I have made a running analysis of the *Teseide*, noting parallel passages in the *Thebaid*. The table is the result of my own comparison of the two, but in checking it up I have freely used the studies of Crescini [1] and Wise,[2] and I hereby disclaim originality. No attempt is made to estimate the intermediate influence of the *Roman de Thebes*.[3]

Book I

After five stanzas of invocation, Boccaccio tells the story of the Amazons. These warlike ladies kill their husbands and male relatives and establish a kingdom of women. Hippolyta is elected queen. Theseus sails against them and conquers their realm after a hard fight. He marries Hippolyta and other Athenians take wives from among the Amazons (sts. 6–138). When the book closes, Theseus and his men are living in idleness and luxury in the Amazonian land.

For this First Book Boccaccio got his material largely from Hypsipyle's account of the Lemnian women in *Thebaid*, v, 49–498. Statius does not call the Lemnian women Amazons, but he lets Hypsipyle make the comparison:

> Amazonio Scythiam fervere tumultu
> Lunatumque putes agmen descendere, ubi arma
> Indulget pater et saevi movet ostia belli (v, 144–146).

Boccaccio did not need the comparison, but it certainly encouraged him. He has made an easy and obvious combination of the Lemnian story with the orthodox legend of Theseus and Hippolyta, which is sufficiently set forth in the *Thebaid*, xii, 163–164, 519–539, 578–579, 761–762. The campaign of Theseus against the Amazons in the *Teseide* is more or less imitated from Statius's account of the attack of the Argonauts on the women warriors of Lemnos.

[1] *Contributo agli Studi sul Boccaccio*, Turin, 1887, pp. 220–247. Cf. *Giornale Storico*, XXXVIII, 447–449.

[2] *The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer*, Baltimore, 1911 (see especially pp. 78–115).

[3] See Crescini, as above; Savj-Lopez, *Giornale Storico*, XXXVIII, 57–78.

i, 6–7. Certain fierce women of Scythia disdain to live under the rule of men and take counsel to slay their husbands and male relatives after the example of the granddaughters of Belus (the Danaids). So, in S v, 85 ff., Polyxo exhorts the Lemnian women: " Firmate animos et pellite sexum " (105). B 7 mentions the Danaids and so does Polyxo (S 117–120).

> E come fér le nipoti di Belo
> Nel tempo cheto agli novelli sposi,
> Così costor ciascuna (i, 7).

> Potuitne ultricia Graiis
> Virginibus dare tela pater, laetusque dolorum
> Sanguine securos iuvenum perfundere somnos?
> At nos vulgus iners? (v, 117–120).

i, 7, 29–33. The Amazons killed fathers, brothers, sons, and husbands. So the Lemnians in S v, 200–201, 206 ff., 235–238, etc.

i. 8. Ippolita is chosen queen. In S v, 320–325 the Lemnians choose Hypsipyle queen.

i, 18. Theseus sails against the Amazons. In S v, 335 ff., the Argonauts sail up to Lemnos.

i, 29–33. See i, 7, above.

i, 47–48. The Amazons have a castle near the shore and other defences, and try to hold them against the invaders. Cf. S v, 350–356.

i, 52. They throw fire and great stones down upon the ships. Cf. S v, 376–389.

i, 61–65. Theseus harangues his men. So Jason in S v, 403–409. Theseus, of course, is present among the Argonautic assailants (v, 432).

i, 66–67. Theseus and others leap overboard into the water. Cf. S v, 402: " medias ardet descendere in undas." Cf. also S, vii, 430 ff.

i, 129–138. Love and marriage between the Amazons and the invaders. The strangers are received with feasting. Cf. S v 445–451.

i, 134. The queen of the Amazons (Ippolita) marries Theseus. Cf. S v, 453–467 (Hypsipyle and Jason). In B there are new sacrifices to Venus (134): cf. S v, 449–450 (" tunc primus in aris Ignis ").

The residence of the Athenians for some time in the Amazonian land, with which Boccaccio's First Book closes and his Second Book begins, is like that of the Argonauts in Lemnos (S v, 459–460).

BOOK II

ii, 1–9. Pirithous reproves Theseus for lingering uxoriously in the land of the Amazons, and Theseus sets sail for Athens.

> Detumuere animi maris, et clementior Auster
> Vela vocat, ratis ipsa moram portusque quietos
> Odit et adversi tendit retinacula saxi.
> Inde fugam Minyae, sociosque appellat Iason (v, 468–471).

In the next four stanzas (10–13) Boccaccio gives a brief summary of the results of the expedition of the Seven against Thebes compiled from several different places in the *Thebaid:* — death of Amphiaraus (vii, 794–823), of Tydeus (viii, end), of Hippomedon (ix, 455–565), of Parthenopaeus (ix, 877 ff.), of Capaneus (x, 927–939), of Eteocles and Polynices (xi, 552–573); Adrastus flees to Argos (xi, 757–761); Creon becomes king of Thebes (xi, 648–655) and refuses burial to the dead Greeks (xi, 661–664).

Stanzas 14–83 of the *Teseide* are well accounted for by Book Twelve of the *Thebaid*, 149–807. They tell of the embassy of the Grecian widows, the expedition of Theseus against Creon, the death of Creon, the sack of Thebes, and the obsequies of the Greek chieftains. There are countless imitations and bits of translation, as was to be expected, but we need not take them up in detail.[1] One of them, however, is worth mentioning, for it marks a point of contact with the Amazonian story. In stanza 52, Creon, defying Theseus, informs him that he is not now fighting against women. So in S xii, 761–762:

> Non cum peltiferis, ait, haec tibi pugna puellis,
> Virgineas nec crede manus, etc.

With stanza 85 of the Second Book Boccaccio begins to be original, for here is the first appearance of Palemone and Arcita. From this point to the end of the book (sts. 84–99) there is little imitation of the *Thebaid*. These twenty stanzas tell how the two young Thebans were found among the dead, taken to Athens, and imprisoned for life. One fine passage in the *Thebaid*, however, has left its mark on this passus of the *Teseide*. It is xii, 22–32, on which Boccaccio had his eye in writing stanza 85. Note especially the striking sentence

> Frigida digeritur strages (xii, 29).

[1] See Crescini, pp. 230–234; Wise, pp. 78 ff.

Book III

Book III tells how Palemone and Arcita fell in love with Emilia, and how Pirithous procured Arcita's release from prison. Here we need expect no influence from the *Thebaid*. With iii, 66, cf. S i, 11–12, and x, 900–901.

Book IV

Book IV describes Arcita's wanderings: he finally returns to Athens and takes service with Theseus, under the name of Penteo. This name is that of a famous Theban king — Pentheus, mentioned in *Thebaid* iv, 565; vii, 211. I note two slight cases of imitation in details of Book iv:

> Dove son ora le case eminenti
> Del nostro primo Cadmo? (iv, 14).

> Sed nec veteris cum regia Cadmi
> Fulmineum in cinerem monitis Iunonis iniquae
> Consedit (iii, 183–185).

> Ove di Dionisio appaion ora,
> Misero a me, gli trionfi indiani? (iv, 15).

> Ceu modo gemmiferum thyrso populatus Hydaspen
> Eoasque domos, nigri vexilla triumphi
> Liber et ignotos populis ostenderet Indos (viii, 237–239).

Book V

Book V, in the first thirty-three stanzas, describes the frantic jealousy of the imprisoned Palemone, and tells how he escapes and takes refuge in a wood, where, as it happens, Arcita is sleeping, So far there is scant opportunity for imitation. In v, 13, however, Boccaccio mentions Tisiphone, summoned by Oedipus, etc. (S i, 46–130). With stanza 34 we again connect with the *Thebaid*.

v, 34–85. Palemone discovers the sleeping Arcita. They fall to fighting, and are separated by Theseus. Here there are manifest resemblances to the struggle of Tydeus and Polynices in the courtyard of Adrastus's palace and their separation by Adrastus in the first

book of the *Thebaid* (376–481).[1] Note that Tydeus discovers Poly-
nices asleep, and that Adrastus (like Theseus in Boccaccio) does not
know who the combatants are. Again, they are both exiles. Theseus
(st. 83) like Adrastus (438–446) demands the names of the rivals and
the cause of their quarrel. Note, too, the kindness of both Theseus
(st. 85) and Adrastus (435–481) in word and deed.

v, 86–105. The combatants disclose their identity and the ground
of their quarrel. Theseus pardons them, suggests a tournament to
settle the question, and gives the rivals hospitality in his palace. Here
there is still a certain likeness to the Adrastus episode in *Thebaid* i.
In both cases the ruler grants hospitality to the two (B v, 104–105; S
i, 481 ff.). Note also that Theseus promises to give Emilia to either
Palemone or Arcita, and that Adrastus marries Tydeus and Polynices
to his daughters (*Thebaid*, ii, 134–261). There is also a trace of Poly-
nices' shame with reference to his ancestry (i, 673–681) in Palemone's
reluctance to wed Emilia because

> Io son di tante infamie solo erede
> De' primi miei rimaso (xii, 24).

In the fight in the wood Boccaccio also has his eye on the combat
between Eteocles and Polynices in *Thebaid*, xi, 387 ff. He mentions
them in v, 59:

> Qua' fossero poi fra loro i due fratelli
> D' Edippo nati non cal raccontare;
> Il fuoco fe' testimonianza d'elli,
> Nel qual fur messi dopo il lor mal fare.

This refers to the famous incident of the divided flame in *Thebaid*,
xii, 420–446. With *Teseide*, v, 65–67, cf. *Thebaid*, xi, 513–520. That
Arcita thinks Palemone dead (v, 68–69) reminds one of *Thebaid*, xi,
552–560, though the spirit of the incident is by no means similar.

Book VI

The Sixth Book of the *Teseide* recounts the muster of knights for the
great tournament. It is mostly occupied with a list of the " barons "
and their description. This book is more or less indebted to the *The-
baid*. A large number of proper names come from that poem.[2] The

---

[1] Cf. Savj-Lopez, *Giornale Storico*, XXXVI, 63–66.
[2] Cf. Crescini, p. 243, note 1.

account of the funeral games for Archemorus (vi) — used later by Boccaccio extensively in Book xi — is drawn on, and so is the account of the muster of the Seven. Some details are worth noting.

According to Boccaccio, King Licurgo came to the muster in black: he was

> ancora lagrimoso
> Per la morte di Ofelte (vi, 14) —

that is, of Opheltes or Archemorus, whose death and burial are described in *Thebaid* v–vi.

" Argeo ed Epidaurio " (vi, 19), if the text is right, looks like an error based on Thebaid vi, 912–913:

> " Iamque aderant instructi armis Epidaurius Agreus
> Et nondum fatis Dircaeus agentibus exul [sc. Polynices].

Agamemnon comes to Athens in a chariot drawn by four great bulls:

> Sopra d'un carro da quattro gran tori
> Tirato dall' Inachia Agamennone
> Vi venne (vi, 21).

He had a black beard and wore a bearskin with gleaming claws over his armor:

> Non armi chiare, non mantel lodato,
> Non pettinati crin, non ornamenti
> D'oro o di pietre aveva, ma legato
> D'orso un velluto cuoio con lucenti
> Unghioni al collo, il quale d'ogni lato
> Ricoprien l'armi tutte rugginenti (vi, 22).

Compare the tigerskin which Hippomedon received as a prize in the funeral games:

> Tunc genitus Talao [sc. Adrastus] victori tigrin inanem
> Ire iubet, fulvo quae circumfusa nitebat
> Margine et extremos auro mansueverat ungues (vi, 721–724).

This same passage (cf. S, ix, 685–686) is also imitated in Boccaccio's description of Evandro:[1]

> Ed era armato d'armi forti e fiere,
> E un cuoio, per mantel, d'orso piloso
> Libistrico, le cui unghie già nere
> Sott' oro eran nascose luminoso (vi, 36).

[1] Evander is not mentioned in the *Thebaid*.

Cromi or Cromis from Etolia is described in *Teseide*, vi, 27–29. He rides on a man-eating horse:

> Sopra Strimon caval di Diomede,
> D'uomini mangiator, come si crede (27).

This is Chromis, son of Hercules (*Thebaid*, vi, 346–350), whose horses in the chariot race at the funeral games were " Getici pecus Diomedis " (348). One of them was named Strymon (464). Boccaccio introduces the creature again in a strange incident in the tournament (viii, 120), to which we shall return presently.

Ippodamo (st. 29) comes next to Cromi in Boccaccio's list, obviously because they are brought together by Statius in the chariot-race: " It Chromis Hippodamusque " etc. (S, vi, 346–354, 436–490). Boccaccio says he was the son of " Eomonia pulita," which is a mis-reading of S, vi, 347: " ab Oenomao."

Nestore from Pilos, son of Neleo, appears in st. 30. He is still a young man. This is from the muster in *Thebaid*, iv:

> Avia Dyme
> Mittit opem densasque Pylos Neleia turmas;
> Nondum nota Pylos iuvenisque aetate secunda
> Nestor, et ire tamen peritura in castra negavit (iv, 124–127).

In stanza 52 comes " Ida Piseo," crowned for his victory in the Olympic Games.

> Prior omnibus Idas,
> Nuper Olympiacis umbratus tempora ramis,
> Prosilit, excipiunt plausu Pisaea iuventus
> Eleaeque manus (vi, 553–556).

He is a contestant in the footrace at the games for Archemorus, and accordingly Boccaccio represents him and his company as fast runners (st. 53). The comparison in this stanza comes from what is said of Parthenopaeus in *Thebaid* vi, 568.

Stanza 61 shows a close translation of *Thebaid*, vii, 340–342.

BOOK VII

vii, 1–21. The kings and barons assemble in the theatre (1–2) — for the theatre cf. *Thebaid*, vi, 249–264 — and Theseus explains the purpose and the rules of the tournament in a speech which the people

applaud (3–14). The two companies are formed, Arcita's and Pale-
mone's (15–21).

In sts. 22–93 we have the prayers of Arcita, Palemone, and Emilia,
with a description of the temples. Here Boccaccio is again much in-
debted to Statius.[1]

vii, 23–28. Arcita prays to Mars. With the vow of hair and beard
(28) cf. *Thebaid*, ii, 255; vi, 198–201, 607–610; viii, 487–488, 492–493.

vii, 29. Mars was in his great and horrible " ospizio " [in Thrace],
and the prayer wings its way thither. The personified prayer feels
terror at the sights it sees. Cf. *Thebaid*, vii, 1–13, when Jupiter
sends Mercury to Thrace with a message to Mars, and vii, 74–75
(terror of Mercury).

vii, 30–38. Description of the region and of the temple of Mars.
Closely translated from *Thebaid*, vii, 34–63, cf. 68.

vii, 39–41. Omens observed by Arcita. Partly from *Thebaid*, vii,
64–69 (cf. ii, 260–261).

vii, 42–49. Palemone prays to Venus.

vii, 50. The prayer flies up to the temple on Mount Cithaeron
(Citerone). Here Boccaccio is misled by the resemblance between the
names *Cythera* and *Cithaeron*.

> Sopra il monte Citerone,
> . . . . dove si posa
> Di Citerea il tempio e la magione
> Infra altissimi prini alquanto ombrosa (st. 50).

Mount Cithaeron, between Boeotia and Attica, is often mentioned in
the *Thebaid*. Note especially —

> Inde plagam qua molle sedens in plana Cithaeron
> Porrigitur lassumque inclinat ad aequora montem
> Praeterit (i, 330–332)
> Amica Cithaeron
> Silva rogis (xii, 52–53).

vii, 51–66. Description of the garden and temple of Venus, also of
the goddess herself. On the resemblance to the Court of Love tra-
dition, see Neilson, who remarks the parallel to Claudian.[2] Though

---

[1] For ceremonies, prayers, and omens, cf. *Thebaid*, ii, 244–261, 704 ff.; viii,
298 ff.

[2] *The Origins and Sources of the Court of Love*, pp. 116–117, 15–17 ([Harvard]
Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, VI).

sts. 51–66 are not from the *Thebaid*, yet the suggestion came from the passage about the temple and region of Mars (above-mentioned, st. 30). Then Boccaccio carried out the suggestion by the use of the Court of Love tradition and of miscellaneous classical material.

vii, 67. Venus hears Palemone's prayer. Strife ensues in heaven between her and Mars, but they find a means to reconcile his petition with Arcita's. Cf. *Thebaid*, iii, 260–316; x, 893–894.

vii, 68–69. Palemone remains at his devotions, etc.

vii, 70–76. Emilia makes an offering to Diana. Description of the temple and the rites. With st. 72 cf. *Thebaid*, ix, 573–574; with st. 75 cf. *Thebaid*, iv, 452–454; with st. 76 cf. *Thebaid*, iv, 461–468.

vii, 77–87. Emilia's prayer. See the prayer to Diana in *Thebaid*, ix, 608 ff. (cf. vi, 633–637).

vii, 88–93. The omen to Emilia. With st. 92 cf. S, ix, 595–596.

vii, 94–145. The combatants assemble in the theatre, and all is ready for the tournament. For st. 94 cf. *Thebaid*, xii, 1–4; for the theatre (108–110) cf. *Thebaid*, vi, 249–264; for the gathering of the people to see the show (112) cf. *Thebaid*, vi, 249–250, etc.

The simile of the lion in st. 106 is from the *Thebaid*, iv, 494–499, and that of the wild boar in st. 119 is expanded from *Thebaid*, xi, 530–531:

> Qual per lo bosco il cinghiar rovinoso,
> Poi ch' ha di dietro a sè sentiti i cani,
> Le setole levate, etc, (119).

> Fulmineos veluti praeceps cum comminus egit
> Ira sues strictisque erexit tergora saetis (xi, 530–531).

Book VIII

The tournament is described — Arcita is victor. There are 131 stanzas. Much of this is mere imitation of the tournaments in the Old French chivalric romances. There is a plethora of proper names, many of them invented *ad hoc*. One very curious incident was suggested by Statius. Cromis rides a man-eating horse. In the tournament

> Di Cromis il roncione,
> Ch' ancora che solea si ricordava
> Gli uomin mangiar, pel braccio Palemone
> Co' denti prese forte, et sì l'aggrava

> Col duol, che 'l fece alla terra cadere,
> Mal grado ch' e' n'avesse, e rimanere.
>
> E quale il drago talora i pulcini
> Dell' aquila ne porta renitenti,
> O fa la leonessa i leoncini
> Per tema degli aguati delle genti;
> Così faceva quel vibrando i crini,
> Forte strignendo Palemon co' denti;
> Cui egli aveva preso in tal maniera
> Che maraviglia aveva chiunque v' era.
>
> E se non fosse ched egli fu atato
> Da' suoi avversi, il caval l' uccidea;
> A cui di bocca appena fu tirato,
> E tratto fuor della crudel mislea,
> E senza alcuno indugio disarmato
> Per Arcita, che l'arme sue volea,
> Per offerirle a Marte, se avvenesse
> Ch' a lui il dì il campo rimanesse (120–122).

And so Palemone lost the tournament and Arcita was declared the victor. In the *Thebaid*, Hippodamus, the chief antagonist of Chromis in the chariot race is thrown:

> Sed Thraces equi ut videre iacentem
> Hippodamum, redit illa fames, iamiamque trementem
> Partiti furiis, ni frena ipsosque frementes
> Oblitus palmae, retro Tirynthius heros
> Torsisset victusque et conlaudatus abisset (vi, 486–490).

As to Chromis's man-eating horse Strymon, see *Teseide*, vi, 27, and *Thebaid*, vi 348, 464 (cf. xii, 155–157).

Book IX

In stanzas 1–9 Boccaccio still imitates Statius. A Fury scares the horse of the victorious Arcita, who is thrown and desperately hurt. So in the *Thebaid*, in the funeral games, a monster frightens Arion, Adrastus' steed, which is driven by Polynices. Polynices is thrown from the chariot and comes near being killed (vi, 491–512). The monster is sent by Phoebus, as the Fury in Boccaccio is sent by Venus. With *Teseide*, ix, 7–8:

Il qual [sc. Arcita's horse] per ispavento in piè levossi,
Ed indietro cader tutto lasciossi.

Sotto il qual cadde il già contento Arcita,
E il forte arcione gli premette il petto,
E sì il ruppe, che una ferita
Tutto pareva il corpo al giovinetto —

compare *Thebaid*, viii, 540–542:

> Ruit ille [sc. equus] ruentem
> In Prothoum lapsasque manu quaerentis habenas
> In voltus galeam clipeumque in pectora calcat.

For the description of the Fury in st. 5, cf. *Thebaid*, i, 90–91, 103–113; with st. 6 cf. *Thebaid*, i, 97–98.

ix, 9–28. Arcita is picked up amid lamentation and receives medical treatment. He recovers his senses, and the victory and Emilia are declared his.

ix, 29–50. Though suffering dreadfully, Arcita rides in a triumphal car. A triumph like a Roman triumph is celebrated.

ix, 51–80. Theseus addresses the warriors and praises their valor on both sides. All the prisoners taken are released except Palemone, who is declared Emilia's prisoner. She sets him free and gives him a ring and a horse and arms.

ix, 81–83. Arcita claims Emilia, and their marriage takes place. For sacrifices at the wedding (83) cf. *Thebaid*, ii, 244–261.

Book X

The first 92 stanzas are mostly original. Those killed in the tournament are burned and their ashes inurned; the wounded receive treatment (1–10). Arcita proves to be mortally wounded; Ischion comes from Epidaurus to treat him, but pronounces the case hopeless (11–14). He grows worse and worse, and bequeaths all he possesses (including Emilia) to Palemone (15–36). His address to Palemone and Palemone's to him; Ippolita and Emilia try to comfort him (37–52). Arcita talks with Emilia, recommending Arcita to her favor; her grief; his lament; general sorrow (53–87). Nine days after the tournament, Arcita begs his friends to prepare sacrifices to Mercury, so that the god may conduct his soul to a pleasant place. Palemone offers

the sacrifices next day (88–92). Arcita's prayer, asserting the inno-
cence of his life; his lament for his youth: he shall love Emilia for-
ever; his death (93–112).

In Arcita's prayer, with the protestations of the innocence of his
life (93 ff.), there is mention of the sins of his race which is reminiscent
of passages in the *Thebaid* and illustrates Boccaccio's intimate know-
ledge of that epic. Sts. 95–96 deal with Cadmus, Agave, Semele, and
Athamas: cf. *Thebaid*, iii, 179–194, and iv, 553–571, in both of which
places all four are mentioned. With the reference to Oedipus in st. 96
cf. particularly the protestations of innocence by the mother of Menoe-
ceus in *Thebaid*, x, 796–797; cf. also i, 233–235:

> Nè amante
> Della mia madre fui, la nazione
> Nel sen materno indietro ritornante
> Siccome Edippo (x, 96).

> Non ego monstrifero coitu revoluta notavi
> Pignora, nec nato peperi funesta nepotes (x, 796–797).

> Scandere quin etiam thalamos hic impius heres
> Patris et immeritae gremium incestare parentis
> Appetiit, proprios monstro revolutus in ortus (i, 233–235).

For other lists of Theban crimes and tragedies see *Thebaid*, i, 1–16,
227–241; xi, 486–492 (cf. i, 673 ff.).

Stanzas 110 and 112, as well as the fifth and sixth stanzas of book
xi, show the influence of the finest passage in the *Thebaid* — one of
the most beautiful, indeed, in the whole range of epic poetry — that
in which the dying Atys calls for Ismene his betrothed (viii, 637–655).
Cf. particularly *Teseide* x, 110, with 648–650; x, 112, with 643–645;
xi, 5–6, with 653–655.

Book XI

This book shows throughout an imitation, often very close, of the
funeral of Archemorus (Opheltes) in the Sixth Book of the *Thebaid*.

xi, 1–12. General grief for Arcita, especial sorrow of Emilia and
Palemone. With sts. 5–6 we have already compared *Thebaid*, viii,
653–655. Sts. 11–12 are influenced by vi, 45–53.

xi, 13–29. Preparation of Arcita's pyre. Note the following paral-
lels: B 14, S, vi, 84–86; B 15, S 54–56, 61–62; B 16, S 25–30, 124–

125; B 18–25, S 84–113 (the pyre of Opheltes is mentioned in B 18); B 26–29, S 54–66, 84–86.

xi, 30–58 (cf. *Thebaid*, vi, 28–237). Arcita's funeral. His ashes are put into an urn. Cf. B 30 with S 28–32; B 31 with S 33–36; B 32 with S 37–43; B 33–34 with S 45–53; B 35–36 with S 67–81, 193–194; B 37 with S 126–128, 210–212; B 38 with S 128–130, 197–198; B 39–40 with S 130–133; B 41 with S 135–141; B 42 with S 197–201; B 43 with S 122–124; B 44 with S 202, 184–185; B 46 with S 184–185; B 47–50 with S 194–203, 206–210; B 51 with S 211–212, 204–205, 130–133; B 52–56 with S 213–226; B 57 with S 234–237.

xi, 59–68. The funeral games (S, 249–946). Cf. B 59 with S vi, 295–296; B 60–61 with S 531–549; B 62 with S 833, 834, 847; B 64 with S 729–734; B 66 with S 646–647.

xi, 69–89. A temple is built by Palemone where the pyre stood. Description of the temple. The history of Arcita's life is represented therein. The suggestion for these stanzas is in *Thebaid*, vi, 242–248 (cf. 268–294).

xi, 90–91. Arcita's urn is placed on a column in the temple, with an inscription.

Book XII

xii, 1–19. Continued grief of Palemone and Emilia. Theseus and the Greeks think it is time for the mourning to cease. Theseus wishes Palemone to marry Emilia. With B st. 6, cf. *Thebaid*, vi, 46–48. For Foroneo (st. 18) see *Thebaid*, ii, 219.

xii, 20–46. Palemone and Emilia have scruples about marriage, but Theseus overrules their objections.

xii, 47–80. Preparations for the wedding. Arcita is forgotten. Description of Emilia (53–64). The marriage ceremony and festivities. With st. 68 cf. *Thebaid*, ii, 244–261.

xii, 81–86. Two months have elapsed since the "high barons" came to Athens for the joust. They return to their several countries. Palemone lives in joy with his wife. Conclusion — The author's address to his book. With B, sts. 84–86, cf. S, xii, 810–819.

The poem closes with a sonnet addressed by the author to the Muses "per lo libro suo" (he beseeches them to give it to his lady) and with the reply of the Muses ("Your lady has named the book *Teseide*"). Cf. S, xii, 810–819.

A STUDY OF EXPOSITION IN GREEK TRAGEDY

By Evelyn Spring[1]

EXPOSITION is that part of dramatic composition which deals with the unfolding of the plot. Every dramatist must provide sufficient elucidation of the past to render intelligible the ever-advancing action of the present. He may complete the necessary explanation in a few lines, or he may continue to enlighten his audience throughout the play, by revealing various circumstances that are antecedent to the action of the drama proper at the moment when the announcement of each is dramatically most effective. To-day there is a tendency among playwrights to choose so simple a plot that few explanatory details are necessary. This is the case with Mr. Masefield's *The Tragedy of Nan*, with Mr. Yeats's *The Land of Heart's Desire*, and with most of Lady Gregory's plays. The method is not restricted, however, to the so-called English neo-romantic school, for it is adopted by M. Maeterlinck in his *L'Oiseau Bleu*, and more conspicuously in his little no-plot plays. The one-act plays of August Strindberg are similarly constructed. But the extreme simplicity that characterizes the work of these dramatists is exceptional. As a rule, the productions of modern writers are more complex, and illustrate very forcibly the difficulties that beset a dramatist who would, in a skilful and original manner, reproduce the past in the course of the continuous scenic action of the present. There are some excellent modern playwrights who do not balk at the old convention which permitted two characters at the beginning of a drama to relate for the benefit of the auditor facts with which they themselves were distress-

ingly familiar. Not yet can we describe as antiquated other methods
of exposition that are equally unskilful, especially the frequent cus-
tom of so massing explanations in the opening scenes of a play as to
make every thing transparently clear to the audience, thereby leaving
no opportunity for the exercise of the imagination. It is always de-
sirable, of course, to avoid obscurity. But when a dramatist confines
his interest in exposition to the opening scenes of a play, he is simply
resorting to a modification of the old and long ago discarded device
of the formal prologue, disguised in dialogue by its more dramatic and
diffuse form. It is fashionable just now to emphasize the modernism
of the ancients. Were the great tragic poets of Greece, like many
modern dramatists, occasionally baffled by the obstacles in the way
of successful exposition, or were there peculiar conditions or conven-
tions of their age which made this aspect of dramatic construction
for them an easier task?

Owing to the phenomenon of the trilogy in Greek drama, a study
of exposition in Greek tragedy naturally falls into two parts: first,
the exposition in the plays of a trilogy which are connected in subject-
matter; second, the exposition in each play considered as a distinct
dramatic entity. The latter investigation is concerned chiefly with
such details as the extent of the preliminary knowledge of the myths
that the poet assumed for his audience, the immediate or gradual
disclosure of events preceding the action of the drama, and various
methods of reproducing the past. The first part of the discussion
centres about the larger question of the interrelation of the plays of
a trilogy which show continuity of plot, for example, the *Oresteia*.
Did the poet present to his audience in each play of this trilogy a drama
complete in itself, or did he think of the individual play as so closely
related to the others of the group that it was not to be regarded as
existing apart from them? For a study of exposition in Greek tragedy
Aeschylus is the most important poet. He is our only source of in-
formation for the technique of the trilogy. In the history of Greek
literature, he is the pioneer poet in the field of the legitimate drama,
historically, because he is credited with the invention of the second
actor, and actually, for us, because our knowledge of the work of
earlier or contemporary poets is so meagre as to make it impossible
to form any accurate conclusions in regard to their methods. The

early tragedies of Aeschylus, therefore, show us Greek tragedy in its embryonic stage. In these the conventions of the Greek theatre and the environment that influenced the dramatic poet are bared to our gaze. Finally, Aeschylus was not only more interested in the technical problems of the drama than either Sophocles or Euripides, but as far as at least exposition is concerned, he was more successful in dramatic construction. Construction has been so generally regarded as the weak point in the technique of Aeschylus that any statement to the contrary seems almost paradoxical. I shall emphasize, accordingly, throughout the paper this aspect of Aeschylus's dramatic genius, and discuss his plays in greater detail than those of Sophocles or Euripides.

I. Exposition in the Trilogy

The general tendency of modern critics is to associate very closely the three dramas of a trilogy. Indeed, the statement that the plays of a trilogy which are connected in subject-matter are but three acts of one great drama is so often heard that it has acquired something of the value of a truism.[1] A few scholars, however, have insisted that each play is complete and intelligible without reference to the others of the group to which it may be related in plot. Twining goes so far as to affirm that the four plays of a tetralogy were not performed at one hearing, but at different festivals,[2] — a theory not supported by the didascalia preserved in epigraphical or literary sources.[3] Böttiger shares Twining's opinion, and emphasizes the self-sufficiency of each play with special emphasis upon the *Prometheus:* [4] " Nimirum perpetuitas ista argumenti, tribus fabulis, mutuo inter se connexis, con-

[1] Cf. G. Hermann, *Aristotelis de Arte Poetica*, Leipzig, 1802, p. 175; A. W. Schlegel, *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, London, 1889, p. 82; F. G. Welcker, *Die Aeschylische Trilogie*, Darmstadt, 1824, pp. 307–308, p. 445, p. 483; R. Westphal, *Prolegomena zu Aeschylus Tragödien*, Leipzig, 1869, p. 5; A. W. Verrall, *The Seven Against Thebes of Aeschylus*, London, 1887, Introduction, p. xxxii.

[2] *Aristotle's Treatise on Poetry*, London, 1812, Vol. II., pp. 332 ff.

[3] Cf. the hypothesis of Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*; the scholiast on the *Frogs* of Aristophanes, v. 67; *C. I. A.*, ii, 2, 973; Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques*, Brussels, 1900, § 881; A. Wilhelm, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen*, Vienna, 1906, p. 40.

[4] *De Medea Euripidea cum priscae artis operibus comparata*, 1803. Cf. *Miscellanea Philologica*, ed. A. H. Matthiae, Vol. I, second edition, Leipzig, 1809, p. 315, footnote.

tinuati, haud dubie maximam vim habitura esset in spectatorum animos, si εἰς μίαν ἀκρόασιν ut cum Aristotele loquamur, res tota perageretur. Tum vero non tres fabulas haberemus, sed unam tantum per quindecim actuum ambages circumductam, quod cogitare ridiculum. . . . Intercidit *Prometheus* Aeschyli *Ignifer* et *Liberatus*, uno, qui inter utrumque medius intercessit, superstite. Verum enimvero diligenter sibi cavit poeta nobilissimus, ne quid inesset fabulae, quod sine ope et adminiculo vel antecedentis vel sequentis ab auditoribus satis liquido ⟨*non*⟩[1] perspici posset. Absolutissima est per se fabula *Promethei Vincti*. Vel hinc apparet illum quoque per extentum, ut cum Horatio loquamur, ambulare funem, qui argumentum perpetuum et per plures fabulas fusum rite explicare ausit."

A priori theories, then, on this point are contradictory and confusing. In order to determine the relation between the plays of a trilogy which show an obvious continuity of plot, it is necessary to examine the subject-matter of the plays themselves. The exposition in closely associated tragedies like the *Agamemnon*, the *Choephoroe*, and the *Eumenides* ought to throw light upon the structure of the trilogy. I propose, therefore, to point out the connection between the different plays of the *Oresteia* and of other trilogies which seem to have been similarly constructed, before I discuss the methods of elucidation employed in each play considered as a distinct dramatic unit.

1. *The Oresteia*

The *Agamemnon* summarizes the plot of the *Choephoroe*. Cassandra says (*Ag.* 1280–1285)[2] that there shall come a son to slay his mother and avenge his father, — an exile returning home to put the coping stone upon the infatuate iniquities of his house. The similarity in expression between line 1282 of the *Agamemnon*,

> Κα.   φυγὰς δ᾽ἀλήτης τῆσδε γῆς ἀπόξενος,

and line 1042 of the *Choephoroe*,

> Ορ.   φεύγω δ᾽ἀλήτης τῆσδε γῆς ἀπόξενος,

---

[1] I have supplied the *non* which seems demanded by the context.

[2] References are to the lines of Sidgwick's edition of Aeschylus and to Gilbert Murray's edition of Euripides in the Oxford texts. Citations from the plays of Sophocles refer to Jebb's edition, Cambridge, 1897.

is noteworthy. A little later (*Ag.* 1317–1319), Cassandra asks the chorus to bear witness that she faced death fearlessly, when, for her, another woman shall die, and another man shall fall for an ill-wedded man. The possible objection to the interpretation of these passages as deliberate preparation for the *Choephoroe* on the ground that Aeschylus here with true dramatic instinct simply seized the opportunity to make the prophetic power of Cassandra effective upon the stage, is eliminated by later references in the *Agamemnon* to the *Choephoroe* which proceed from the mouth of the chorus. Several lines are clear echoes of the definite summary of the plot of the *Choephoroe* already revealed by the despairing prophetess; 1646–1648 constitute a repetition in brief of 1280–1285 and 1317–1319, for the chorus ask whether Orestes is not alive that he may return home with favoring fortune, and slay the guilty pair. The significance of these verses is, of course, none the less clear, though the suggestions are put in interrogative form as a possibility, not as a fact. They are a concrete restatement of Cassandra's less direct utterances. But more convincing proofs of deliberate preparation for the second play of the trilogy are not lacking. The chorus envisage (1428) a clot of blood over Clytaemnestra's eyes, and announce (1429–1430) that she must atone for her deed, blow for blow. Again they state (1535–1536) that Fate is sharpening Justice on another whetstone for another dreadful deed. The chorus cannot know the facts they reveal at this point, but Aeschylus with the thought of the *Choephoroe* clearly in his mind, not unnaturally permitted the elders to indulge in moral clairvoyance. Finally, in response to the threats of Aegisthus, they say (1667) that they have no fear, if Fate but guide Orestes's footsteps homeward. The *Agamemnon* makes no preparation for the third play of the trilogy, but verses 617 ff. and 674–680 may look forward to the *Proteus*. In response to the inquiries of the chorus for Menelaus, the messenger announces that he disappeared in a storm at sea, but warns them to expect first and foremost his return. The question of the chorus is also intended to show that the elders distrust Clytaemnestra.

Unlike the *Agamemnon*, the *Choephoroe* does not summarize the following play of the trilogy, but it does prepare for the *Eumenides*. Clytaemnestra warns Orestes (924) to beware a mother's vengeful hounds, and Orestes beseeches Helios (993–997) to be his witness in

court that he slew his mother justly. The frequent references to the
Erinyes (1048–1062), whether they actually appeared upon the scene
or are merely creations of Orestes's disordered fancy, are also prophetic
of the events of the *Eumenides*. Verses 1059–1060 look forward to
the ceremonial rite of purification performed by Apollo for Orestes,[1]
and the latter's announcement (1035–1038) of his plan to approach
Loxias's shrine foreshadows the opening scene of the *Eumenides*.
Wilamowitz's emendation[2] of lines 1040 ff., which keeps the reading
of the Medicean manuscript, introduces a reference to Menelaus into
the passage. If this is correct, the *Choephoroe* like the *Agamemnon*
anticipates the *Proteus*.

Aeschylus, accordingly, made definite preparation in the first play
of the trilogy for the second, and in the second for the third. His
method varied. The *Agamemnon* summarizes the whole plot of the
Choephoroe. The latter play provides no résumé of the *Eumenides*,
but it alludes to events of the third play of the trilogy, and paves
the way for the opening scene.

Furthermore, each play of the *Oresteia* contains allusions to the
preceding play or plays. It is often difficult to distinguish between
a particular reference to a preceding tragedy and a general reference
to facts of a myth which the poet might take for granted were per-
fectly familiar to his audience. In the *Choephoroe*, for example,
Orestes announces (563–564) to the chorus and Electra that Pylades
and he will imitate the Phocian dialect, and states (679) that he learned
of Orestes's death from Strophius the Phocian. Do these verses con-
stitute a definite allusion to lines 880–881 of the *Agamemnon*, where
Clytaemnestra says that Strophius the Phocian has Orestes in his
care, or are they simply a general reference to a version of the myth
which other poets had previously popularized? We know that
Pindar[3] had already represented Orestes as the guest of Strophius
who dwelt at the foot of Parnassus. Again, when Orestes states

---

[1] Cf. *Eum.* 282–283; 576–578.

[2] *Aeschylos Orestie, Zweites Stück, Das Opfer am Grabe*, Berlin, 1896, p. 136:

> 1040:   τὰ δ᾽ἐν χρόνωι μοι πάντας Ἀργείους λέγω
> 1041b: ⟨μνήμηι φυλάσσειν, οἵ᾽⟩ ἐπορσύνθη κακά,
> 1041a: καὶ μαρτυρεῖν μοι Μενέλεως ⟨ὅταν μόληι⟩.

[3] *Pyth.* 11, 34 ff., ed. W. Christ, Leipzig, 1896.

(*Cho.* 8–9) that he was not present at his father's death or burial, we cannot tell whether this is a deliberate echo of line 877 of the *Agamemnon*, where Clytaemnestra comments on the absence of Orestes, or merely a mention of a stereotyped detail of the myth. When the chorus (*Cho.* 649–651) speak of the child which Erinys brings into the house to atone for its pollution, did the spectators then remember how Cassandra saw the clear vision of that child (*Ag.* 1280–1281), and how the chorus threatened Aegisthus with the vengeance of Orestes (*Ag.* 1646–1648; 1667)? The objection may be raised here that by the time of Aeschylus the myths had assumed so many protean shapes in the hands of various poets that it was essential for Aeschylus to make his own version clear. Very true; but as I shall show in my discussion of the separate plays,[1] his individual treatment[2] of a given myth is not always, to us at least, perfectly lucid. Hence it is dangerous to be dogmatic when interpreting doubtful passages such as I have cited. It is necessary, therefore, to discuss only those lines which, beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt, may be regarded as deliberate allusions to a preceding play.

There are frequent references in the *Choephoroe* to the manner in which Clytaemnestra slew her husband in the first play of the trilogy. The details of the great king's death described so vividly in the *Agamemnon* are reiterated. Once more the spectators were reminded of the doom that came upon him suddenly when in the bath,[3] and of the suffocating net[4] or robe[5] that helped to consummate the deed. There are also lines in the *Choephoroe* which are so strongly reminiscent of

[1] Cf. below, pp. 210 ff.

[2] It is surprising to see how many details of a particular myth did remain constant. Tucker in his edition of the *Choephoroe* (Cambridge, 1901, Introduction, p. xviii, footnote) comments on the extraordinary fact that the tragic writers of Athens, who are always quick to introduce a reference to their own city, show no traces of the tradition that Orestes came back from Athens. The explanation is possibly this: as soon as the introduction of the ritual of Apollo the Purifier had associated the vengeance of Orestes with that god, the residence of Orestes in Phocis, in the neighborhood of the oracle, would tend to become a fixed element in the myth.

[3] Cf. *Cho.* 491; 668–671; 983–985 with *Ag.* 1107–1109; 1128–1129; 1538–1540.

[4] Cf. *Cho.* 492; 985–986 with *Ag.* 1114–1117; 1382–1383.

[5] Cf. *Cho.* 493–494; 986; 1011–1011 with *Ag.* 1126–1128; 1383; 1492–1493; 1580–1581.

passages in the *Agamemnon* that they may be interpreted as direct allusions to the first play of the trilogy. In the *Choephoroe* (920), Clytaemnestra attempts to gloss over her guilt by dwelling upon the lonely life that a woman leads when bereft of her husband,

ἄλγος γυναιξὶν ἀνδρὸς εἴργεσθαι, τέκνον,

an extenuating circumstance already touched upon in the *Agamemnon* (861–862),

τὸ μὲν γυναῖκα πρῶτον ἄρσενος δίχα
ἧσθαι δόμοις ἔρημον ἔκπαγλον κακόν.

The other excuses, also, which Clytaemnestra proffers in the *Choephoroe* recall her attempt to palliate her sins in the preceding tragedy. In each play she refers to Agamemnon's love for another woman,[1] and endeavors to shift the moral responsibility for her husband's death to the curse that rests upon their house.[2] Furthermore, two passages in the *Choephoroe* describe the circumstances of Agamemnon's death. Of these, the first (132–134) seems frankly expositional in character; the second and longer passage (973–1006) is dramatically effective, and at the same time illustrative of the gradual exposition of the past which was a characteristic method of Aeschylus.[3]

The *Eumenides*, like the *Choephoroe*, contains definite mention of the details of Agamemnon's murder, and emphasizes again the importance of the bath[4] and the net[5] or the robe.[6] It also reviews in two passages the chief events of the *Agamemnon*. These two summaries are analogous to the two summaries of the *Agamemnon* in the *Choephoroe*. The first (458–461) is chiefly explanatory in character; the second (625–635) increases the tension of the trial of Orestes. It is introduced as a part of Apollo's argument, and is designed to affect the emotions of the jury. The *Eumenides* similarly alludes to passages in the *Choephoroe*. The statement that Orestes killed his mother at

---

[1] Cf. *Cho.* 918 with *Ag.* 1438–1447.

[2] Cf. *Cho.* 908–910 with *Ag.* 1475–1477; 1500–1504; 1568–1571.

[3] Cf. below, pp. 192 ff.

[4] Cf. *Eum.* 461; 631–633 with *Ag.* 1107–1109; 1128–1129; 1538–1540.

[5] Cf. *Eum.* 460 with *Ag.* 1114–1117; 1382–1383.

[6] Cf. *Eum.* 458–461; 634–635 with *Ag.* 1126–1128; 1383; 1492–1493; 1580–1581.

the bidding of Apollo is reiterated,[1] and emphasis is again put upon the command of Loxias that Orestes come to his shrine.[2] The *Eumenides* also furnishes a summary (462–467) of the main events of the second play of the trilogy.

In the *Oresteia*, therefore, the practice of Aeschylus in alluding in one play of the trilogy to a preceding play was more uniform than his method of preparing in the first or in the second play of the group for a following drama. The *Agamemnon* looks forward to the *Choephoroe*, and possibly to the *Proteus*, but not to the *Eumenides*. The *Eumenides*, however, makes clear reference to the events of both the *Agamemnon* and the *Choephoroe*. These allusions forward and back to the different plays of the trilogy undoubtedly establish a close connection between them that was intentional on the part of Aeschylus. The appeal of Orestes (*Cho.* 491) to his father to remember the bath in which he was slain, would lose much of its pathos and force did not the spectators recall Cassandra's prophecy and vision of that very death in the *Agamemnon*. An audience in whose ears were still ringing her frenzied utterances at the time of the consummation of the murder would be quick to grasp the terrific irony of Clytaemnestra's welcome to the strangers, when she announces (*Cho.* 668–671) that her house has warm baths for their comfort. Surely when Orestes displays (*Cho.* 985) the robe stained with his father's blood, referring to it as a δίκτυον, the sympathy of the spectators for Orestes was increased as they remembered Clytaemnestra's exultant mention of the net (*Ag.* 1382–1383), and her pride in the accomplishment of her unholy desire. Especially worthy of notice here is Clytaemnestra's appeal to Orestes (*Cho.* 920):

ἄλγος γυναιξὶν ἀνδρὸς εἴργεσθαι, τέκνον.

This line, touched with pathos and spoken in all sincerity, as Clytaemnestra pleads for her life, would lose much of its power, if Aeschylus's audience did not recall the hollow mockery and dissimulation of the same thought as expressed in the *Agamemnon* (861–862). In the same way, although Clytaemnestra in the *Choephoroe* offers virtually the same excuses for her crime that she does in the *Agamemnon*,[3]

[1] Cf. *Eum.* 84; 579–580 with *Cho.* 269–273.
[2] Cf. *Eum.* 205; 577 with *Cho.* 1038–1039.
[3] Cf. below, p. 146; pp. 148–149.

yet the excuses of the *Choephoroe* contrast effectively with those of
the first play. In the *Agamemnon*, Clytaemnestra seems as terribly
sincere after the murder as she is in the *Choephoroe*, but her protesta-
tions at the moment of impending death have the saving grace of
pathos. Aeschylus also desired his audience to realize that she still
wishes to palliate her guilt.

Not to go into detail unnecessarily, I shall cite what seems to me
to be the best illustration of the dependence of each play of the trilogy
upon the others of the group. Although the allusions in the *Choe-
phoroe* to the dream of Clytaemnestra do not definitely refer to the
Agamemnon, they show that the poet assumed for his audience the
clear recollection of the first play of the trilogy. In the *Agamemnon*
(274–275), Clytaemnestra is scornful of dreams. There is no reason
to suspect that she is not sincere in this passage, and that she really
is speaking the truth is probable from lines 891–894, where, in the
presence of her husband, among other fabrications, the queen dwells
upon the terrifying dreams that have disturbed her during his absence.
To an audience that understood her real contempt of dreams her
power of dissimulation here must have been the more admirable and
the more insolent in the face of the chorus who know her sin. The
Clytaemnestra of the *Agamemnon* is at all times fearless, although
not, perhaps, for the reason that she proclaims (*Ag.* 1434–1436),

> οὔ μοι φόβου μέλαθρον ἐλπὶς ἐμπατεῖ,
> ἕως ἂν αἴθῃ πῦρ ἐφ’ ἑστίας ἐμῆς
> Αἴγισθος, ὡς τὸ πρόσθεν εὖ φρονῶν ἐμοί.

But in the *Choephoroe*, Aeschylus wished to indicate that a change
has come over Clytaemnestra in this respect, and that the guilty
queen now knows what fear is. This transformation, however, he
could not possibly bring home to the spectators, if he did not take it
for granted that they would recall her attitude toward dreams and
her fearlessness in general, as revealed in the *Agamemnon*. For be-
yond all doubt, the Clytaemnestra of the *Choephoroe* has come to
give credence to the dreams that shake her soul with terror. The
chorus refer vaguely at first (32–46) to the fear arising from dreams
that holds sway within the palace, and later, state openly (523–525)
that the queen, alarmed by visions of the night, has sent libations to

Agamemnon's tomb. The fact that Clytaemnestra mentions her dream (928) just before her death proves convincingly that she feared it. Similarly, in the *Eumenides*, lines 104–105,

$$\text{εὕδουσα γὰρ φρὴν ὄμμασιν λαμπρύνεται,}$$
$$\text{ἐν ἡμέρᾳ δὲ μοῖρ᾽ ἀπρόσκοπος βροτῶν,}$$

where Clytaemnestra rebukes the sleeping Furies, although these verses are lovely enough in themselves, yet they demand for an appreciation of their supreme significance the vivid recollection of Clytaemnestra's earlier attitude toward dreams, as revealed in both of the preceding plays. A later passage in the *Eumenides* (106–110), which tells us that the queen, alarmed after the death of her husband, attempted to appease the Erinyes with many sacrifices, shows us the terror-stricken Clytaemnestra of the *Choephoroe* in contrast to the resolute woman of the first play of the trilogy.

This is proof not only of the intimate relation between the three plays of the *Oresteia*, but also of Aeschylus's skill in seizing the enlarged opportunity presented by the trilogy to portray the development of character. Modern critics seem strangely blind to the dramatic advantages of the trilogy in this respect. Sidney Lanier [1] comments on the absence of all provision for the growth of personality in the dramas of Aeschylus, and Brander Matthews,[2] although conscious of the other opportunities that the trilogy provided for a skilful dramatist, does not discuss the possibility afforded by the larger dramatic unity for marking the evolution of character. The Clytaemnestra of the *Choephoroe*, as we have seen, is broken down with fear. Another illustration of the interest and skill of Aeschylus in depicting the transformation of character is seen in that part of the *Choephoroe* where the poet emphasizes the love of Clytaemnestra for Aegisthus. At line 585 begins a choral ode describing the passionate love of women. Since it immediately precedes the interview of Orestes with his mother, it is but natural to apply its moral to her. Indeed, lines 626–627,

$$\text{γυναικοβούλους τε μητίδας φρενῶν}$$
$$\text{ἐπ᾽ ἀνδρὶ τευχεσφόρῳ,}$$

---

[1] *The English Novel*, New York, 1897, p. 90.
[2] *The Development of the Drama*, New York, 1903, pp. 70–71.

seem a direct allusion to Clytaemnestra. Other references in the play to her passion for Aegisthus are more open. When she learns of the death of her lover, she utters a cry of deepest anguish (*Cho.* 893),

οἲ 'γώ. τέθνηκας, φίλτατ' Αἰγίσθου βία,

and Orestes questions her scornfully (*Cho.* 894–895):

φιλεῖς τὸν ἄνδρα; τοίγαρ ἐν ταὐτῷ τάφῳ
κείσει. θανόντα δ'οὔτι μὴ προδῷς ποτε.

Finally, after Pylades's words of warning, he taunts his mother bitterly with her love for her paramour (*Cho.* 904–907):

ἕπου, πρὸς αὐτὸν τόνδε σὲ σφάξαι θέλω.
καὶ ζῶντα γάρ νιν κρείσσον' ἡγήσω πατρός.
τούτῳ θανοῦσα ξυγκάθευδ', ἐπεὶ φιλεῖς
τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον, ὃν δ'ἐχρῆν φιλεῖν στυγεῖς.

In remarkable contrast to these passages in the *Choephoroe*, the *Agamemnon* strikes no note of real passion. I do not mean that the erotic motive is not present in the *Agamemnon*. He who runs may read it between the lines.[1] But Aeschylus did not give verbal expression to it in that play. Even after Agamemnon's death, Clytaemnestra speaks of Aegisthus with marvelous reserve (*Ag.* 1436):

Αἴγισθος, ὡς τὸ πρόσθεν εὖ φρονῶν ἐμοί.

Her allusion to the death of Cassandra, as having provided an additional delight for her luxurious couch (*Ag.* 1444–1447), is an outburst of fiendish glee rather than of deep affection for Aegisthus. At the end of the play (*Ag.* 1672–1673), Clytaemnestra is almost womanly in her desire to protect Aegisthus from the upbraidings of the chorus, but her real passion is still controlled, and in no way can she be said to cling to her lover. By suppressing any allusion in the *Choephoroe* to the sacrifice of Iphigenia as a motive for Clytaemnestra's crime, and by throwing into high relief the love of the queen for Aegisthus, Aeschylus was able to depict her as a woman no longer capable of that perfect control of her feelings which marks her character in the *Agamemnon*. This emphasis upon the erotic motive in the *Choeporoe*, has also great dramatic importance.[2] It is one of many instances of

[1] Cf. *Ag.* 1223–1226; 1625–1627.   [2] Cf. below, p. 153.

Aeschylus's versatile technique. In the *Eumenides*, we find a Clytaemnestra who more strongly resembles the virile queen of the *Agamemnon* than the weaker woman of the *Choephoroe*. Death has not made her more gentle, but has restored her former steadfastness of purpose.

A transformation of a different nature has come over the Orestes of the *Eumenides* as contrasted with the Orestes of the *Choephoroe*. In the latter tragedy (269–273), when Orestes is recounting to Electra the command of the oracle that he must slay the murderers of his father, it is the penalty for disobedience, not the divine injunction of Loxias, that seems to inspire him with courage for the act. Besides, in the passage (297–304) where he gives various motives for his determination to kill his mother, the commands of the oracle are but one of many impelling influences. At the crucial moment he hesitates (879), and Pylades must needs admonish him of the consequences of failure to consummate the deed at the behest of the god (*Cho.* 900–902). But in the *Eumenides* (85–87), Orestes appears as a man who who has been purified of all doubt by his sufferings. His religious nature has deepened. There are not a few outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace that has come upon him. Above all else, he is perfectly convinced of the righteousness of Apollo. His submission is not due to mere physical exhaustion, because Orestes himself bears witness to the lessons that sorrow has taught him (276–279).

In another point of minor importance, the interest of Aeschylus in the evolution of character is apparent. The love of luxurious living which seems to have been a trait of both Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus is merely suggested in the *Agamemnon*, but emphasized more distinctly in the *Choephoroe*. In the first play of the trilogy, there is just a hint of this when the queen says (1574–1576) that it is enough, though she have little wealth, to have freed the house of its madness that makes one man destroy another. But in the *Choephoroe*, there are several definite references to this *penchant* of the guilty pair. Electra refers (135–137) to the riotous existence indulged in by the inheritors of her father's possessions, the chorus exult (942–945) in the release of the house from its two ravagers, and Orestes refers (973–974) to the dead lovers as plunderers within the palace.

Suggestive of this, also, are the frequent allusions to Orestes as deprived of his possessions.[1]

These are some of the instances of the superiority, for dramatic purposes, of the trilogy over the separate play. A Greek audience of the fifth century before Christ, as it witnessed the production of a trilogy, must have experienced a very unique and composite kind of pleasure. If, when they viewed the *Agamemnon* and the *Choephoroe*, their imaginations were stimulated by many passages prophetic of the plays to follow, their emotions could have been no less deeply stirred by the piercing echoes in the latter tragedies of all that had preceded. Upon first consideration, therefore, it would appear that each play of the *Oresteia* is so closely related to the others of the group that it cannot be regarded as an independent dramatic entity. But here the question arises whether each tragedy would be intelligible to an audience that had not witnessed the preceding play or plays. Let us apply this test to the *Choephoroe* and to the *Eumenides*. For this investigation it is only the definite allusions to preceding plays that are significant, because, as I shall point out in discussing the individual tragedies, the audience was clearly supposed to be conversant with the general outlines of the myth.[2]

The *Choephoroe* is intelligible without assuming for the audience any knowledge of the *Agamemnon*. When Orestes beseeches the spirit of his father (*Cho.* 491) to remember the bath in which he was slain, he alludes to an event that took place in the first play of the trilogy. Now the manner of Agamemnon's death, if we may draw our conclusions from extant dramas, was a detail of the myth upon which a poet was likely to exercise his imagination and display his originality. But even if the murder of the king in a bath was a version of the myth peculiar to Aeschylus, the allusion to it here is perfectly clear from the context. Similarly, lines 668–671 of the *Choephoroe* present no obscurity; lines 983–985, if puzzling in their context, have already been illuminated by line 491. The references to the net or the robe are also lucid without any prior knowledge of the *Agamemnon*. The excuses, too, that Clytaemnestra gives in the *Choephoroe* are intelligible without reference to the preceding tragedy, even if they did not awaken in the minds of the spectators (as they must have done)

---

[1] Cf. *Cho.* 249–250; 275; 301; 407–409; 865.   [2] Cf. below, pp. 170 ff.

the memory of similar excuses familiar to them already from Homer. Orestes, for instance, is ashamed to name the price which his mother got for selling him (*Cho.* 917),

αἰσχύνομαί σοι τοῦτ' ὀνειδίσαι σαφῶς,

and Clytaemnestra replies (*Cho.* 918):

ἀλλ' εἴφ' ὁμοίως καὶ πατρὸς τοῦ σοῦ μάτας.

Here the allusion to Agamemnon's love for another woman is unmistakable, without the recollection of passages in the first play of the trilogy that speak more plainly.[1] It is not necessary for the sake of clarity that Clytaemnestra should name Cassandra; in any case, the identity of her husband's mistress must have been known to an audience familiar with Homeric traditions.[2] Verses 908–910 of the *Choephoroe* are self-explanatory, and touch upon mythical details which were perhaps already matters of common knowledge, since Homer had represented Clytaemnestra as impelled to sin, not only because of Aegisthus's entreaties, but also because of the decrees of Fate.[3]

The *Eumenides*, also, is clear without the assumption that the audience possessed any familiarity with the *Agamemnon*. For lines 460–461 seem to me lucid in themselves, but any possible obscurity is obliterated a little later when the murder of Agamemnon is described in detail.[4] Similarly, the *Eumenides* does not demand, as far as clarity is concerned, the recollection of the *Choephoroe*. Line 84 is a repetition of the information given in lines 269 ff. of the preceding tragedy, and line 205, without regard to lines 1038–1039 of the *Choephoroe*, explains why Orestes appears at Loxias's shrine as a suppliant at the beginning of the play. It may be objected that, assuming no preliminary knowledge of the *Choephoroe*, the significance of the opening scene of the *Eumenides* would remain, if not actually obscure, at least ineffective, until line 205. But undoubtedly the spectators were supposed to be conversant with the outlines of the myth,[5] so that it is unreasonable to think that actually they would have to wait for complete enlightenment.

---

[1] *Ag.* 1438–1447. [2] *Odyssey*, 11, 421 ff. [3] *Odyssey*, 3, 269.
[4] *Eum.* 631–635. [5] Cf. below, pp. 170 ff.

There are other evidences, too, of the independent character of each play. If the *Oresteia* may be regarded as the norm of an Aeschylean trilogy, it was evidently not the practice of the poet to explain in the second and in the third dramas of the group details that he left obscure in preceding plays. Why, for instance, was Orestes away from home when his father returned from Troy? Clytaemnestra says (*Ag.* 877 ff.) that she sent Orestes to Strophius at the entreaty of the latter, who warned her of the danger to her son at Argos. But she is so audaciously insincere throughout the entire speech that the natural supposition is that she is consistently lying when she explains the absence of Orestes. Since Clytaemnestra affirms that she sent away Orestes at the instigation of Strophius, the most unsophisticated of Aeschylus's audience would be quick to suspect that actually she was desirous of getting rid of Orestes.[1] The *Choephoroe* is no more illuminating than the *Agamemnon* in regard to this matter. Orestes (*Cho.* 915) refers to the fact that he was sold by his mother,

$$αἰσχρῶς ἐπράθην ὦν ἐλευθέρου πατρός,$$

but since Electra (*Cho.* 132) uses the same expression of both Orestes and herself,

$$πεπραμένοι γὰρ νῦν γέ πως ἀλώμεθα,$$

we must be careful not to interpret line 915 too literally, as Verrall does.[2] The most important passage in the *Choephoroe* for the solution of this difficulty is line 913 where Orestes says that his mother cast him forth to misery. But this, like line 915, may be figurative. We may perhaps go so far as to say that Clytaemnestra was responsible for the absence of Orestes, whether she herself sent him away, or a

---

[1] *Ag.* 1282: φυγὰς δ᾽ἀλήτης τῆσδε γῆς ἀπόξενος cannot be adduced as proof that Clytaemnestra really banished Orestes (cf. T. D. Seymour, *On the Duration of the Action of the Orestean Trilogy, Classical Review* VIII, 1894, p. 439), because of the loose use of the word φυγάς in Greek literature. In the *Electra* of Euripides line 233: ποῦ γῆς ὁ τλήμων τλήμονας φυγὰς ἔχων; cannot be interpreted literally as meaning that Orestes was banished. The poet has already explained (16 ff.) that the old nurse of Agamemnon rescued Orestes from the hands of Aegisthus and gave him to Strophius.

[2] *The Choephoroe of Aeschylus*, London, 1893, Introduction, p. xv. Verrall keeps the Medicean reading διχῶς, and understands διχῶς ἐπράθην to mean " a two-fold sale of me."

friend rescued him from peril. The *Choephoroe*, however, leaves the details as obscure as they are in the *Agamemnon*.

Several passages in the *Choephoroe* also show that the poet did not attempt to supplement the events of the *Agamemnon* by providing additional information in the second play of the trilogy. There are four of these passages.[1] Unfortunately for our purposes, however, the interpretation of all, with the exception of lines 429–433, is disputed by scholars, who do not agree upon a point that for the present discussion is most important, — namely, the time when the events here described took place.[2] When did the chorus display the emotions to which they refer (*Cho.* 423–428) ? When did the mutilation of Agamemnon occur (*Cho.* 439–443) ? When did Electra bewail her father's death (*Cho.* 444–450) ? There has been a general tendency to refer these occurrences to the time either of Agamemnon's death or of his funeral. K. O. Müller solves the difficulty somewhat too easily by affirming that all these passages describe the circumstances of the burial of the king.[3] But the time of the mutilation is only vaguely indicated in the text (*Cho.* 439–443), and for that reason it is not possible to dogmatize to the extent that Müller does. A careful examination of the text, however, puts no obstacles in the way of the statement that these passages allude to events that occurred between the close of the *Agamemnon* and the beginning of the *Choephoroe*, some of which may have preceded the burial itself, for example, the mourning of the chorus for Agamemnon and the mutilation of his body. According to this interpretation, these passages of the *Choephoroe* do not illuminate the *Agamemnon* itself, but rather the period of time which elapses between the first and the second play of the trilogy.

In the *Eumenides*, also, there is one passage that refers to a fact not revealed in the preceding tragedies. It is in this third play of the

[1] 423–428; 429–433; 439–433; 444–450.

[2] Cf. F. Blaydes, *Aeschyli Choephoroe*, Halle, 1899, p. 131; J. Conington, *The Choephoroe of Aeschylus*, London, 1857, p. 68; J. A. Hartung, *Aeschylus Muttermörder*, Leipzig, 1853, p. 155; T. W. Peile, *The Choephoroe of Aeschylus*, London, 1844, pp. 208 ff; T. G. Tucker, *The Choephoroe of Aeschylus*, Cambridge, 1901, p. 101 and pp. 105–106; A. W. Verrall, *The Choephoroe of Aeschylus*, London, 1893, pp. 61 ff. and p. 65; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aeschylos Orestie*, Berlin, 1896, pp. 200–201; *Aeschylos Interpretationen*, Berlin, 1914, p. 207.

[3] *Dissertation on the Eumenides of Aeschylus*, London, 1853, pp. 204–205.

trilogy (106–109) that the spectators learned for the first time that Clytaemnestra during her lifetime made many sacrifices to the Erinyes. In the *Choephoroe*, mention was made only of the libations at Agamemnon's tomb. The sacrifices to the Erinyes cannot have been offered in the course of the dramatic action of either the *Agamemnon* or the *Choephoroe*. This allusion to them, then, in the *Eumenides*, throws light not on the details of the preceding plays, but rather on events that took place in the interval between the end of the *Agamemnon* and the beginning of the *Choephoroe*.

But it was not the primary intention of Aeschylus, in touching upon circumstances which occur between the plays, to clarify that obscure period of time.[1] In the first place, if it were the purpose of the poet to inform his audience of events that took place in the interval between two plays, he furnished astonishingly few facts. In the second place, he did not enlighten his audience in regard to points of real importance. If his intention was to make the spectators cognizant of the past, surely it was more important for them to know how many years elapse between the end of the *Agamemnon* and the beginning of the *Choephoroe*, and how Orestes first learned of the oracle that directed him to slay his mother, than that they should hear that the chorus lamented Agamemnon's death, and that Electra wept piteously for her father! Rather the poet touched upon these events, not so much that he might elucidate obscure or important occurrences of the past, as that he might render more dramatically effective the plays in which these allusions are provided. The lines, for instance, which describe Electra's sorrow for her father's death (*Cho.* 444–450), are picturesquely pathetic, but not of special significance for the audience's knowledge of antecedent circumstances. In their context, however, they are admirable, because they not only win the sympathy of the spectators for Electra and Orestes, but are also an important factor in inspiring Orestes to resolve upon his deed of vengeance. Lines 429–433 and 433–443 of the *Choephoroe* should be similarly interpreted. Here Aeschylus obviously dwelt upon occurrences which took place between the end of the *Agamemnon* and the beginning of the *Choephoroe*, not primarily to clear up the past, but to appeal to the emotions of his audience, — in short, to arouse in them the Aris-

[1] Cf. K. O. Müller, *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

totelian " pity and terror." In lines 106–109 of the *Eumenides*, too, Aeschylus did not announce that Clytaemnestra had sacrificed to the Erinyes on many occasions in order that the spectators might realize that she had been haunted by fear in the interval between the murder of Agamemnon and the beginning of the *Choephoroe*. The terror of Clytaemnestra he had already sufficiently emphasized in the *Choephoroe*. But the dramatic exigencies of the *Eumenides* made the revelation of her sacrifices to the Erinyes desirable at this time, and Aeschylus did not miss his opportunity. He deliberately represented Clytaemnestra as so little overcome with remorse after death, that those very goddesses whom in life she had often sought to appease with offerings she now beseeches to avenge her. A more startling manifestation of the *do ut des* doctrine could scarcely be imagined. Clytaemnestra asks the Erinyes to help her because when alive she made sacrifices to them to avert their attacks upon her!

From another aspect each play of the *Oresteia* is in itself a complete dramatic product. Aeschylus chose to represent Clytaemnestra in the *Agamemnon* as chiefly influenced to murder her husband because of the sacrifice of Iphigenia. The fact that in the *Choephoroe* Aeschylus suppressed this motive, and threw into high relief the passion of Clytaemnestra for Aegisthus, gives an entirely new atmosphere to the second play. If, therefore, we may regard the *Oresteia* as characteristic of Aeschylus's peculiar manipulation of the trilogy, it is exceedingly dangerous to postulate the contents of a missing play of a connected group from the subject-matter of an extant play of the same trilogy. The new emphasis in the *Choephoroe* has its dramatic significance. The erotic motive for the murder of Agamemnon would be particularly likely to inspire Electra and Orestes with hatred for their mother, and reasonably strengthen the justice of their vengeance. Besides, any allusion in the *Choephoroe* to Iphigenia as a motive for Clytaemnestra's crime would justify too much, for the dramatic exigencies of this play, her claims upon the mercy of Orestes. The only direct allusion in the *Choephoroe* to the sacrifice of Iphigenia is so untimely that this excuse of Clytaemnestra's, made so much of in the *Agamemnon*, seems to have been virtually abandoned by the poet. Electra refers (*Cho.* 242) to Iphigenia as piteously slain, at the very moment when she greets her brother as the restorer of her father's house (*Cho.* 235–

237)! In revealing Clytaemnestra's love of luxury more clearly in the *Choephoroe* than in the *Agamemnon*, the poet's intention was simply to bring out the heartlessness of Agamemnon's wife as greater justification for the crime that her son must commit. By means of every possible device, the poet endeavored in the *Choephoroe* to depict her cruelty. The harshness toward her servants, which she had already exhibited in the *Agamemnon*, is intensified in the following tragedy. Noteworthy in this connection is the suggestion of the chorus (439–442) that Clytaemnestra, when she murdered and mutilated Agamemnon, was eager to make life unendurable for Orestes, — an inhuman motive for the murder which, of course, cannot be taken seriously. The passive Orestes of the *Eumenides*, as contrasted with the struggling Orestes of the *Choephoroe*, is another case in point. Apollo defends Orestes in the last play of the trilogy with the plea that he killed his mother by divine command. It was in keeping, therefore, with the dramatic purposes of the poet to portray Orestes as perfectly resigned to the will of the god.

Aeschylus, accordingly, did not attempt to fill in the occasionally dim outline of events depicted in preceding plays; he did not try to clarify the interval between the plays. He simply sought to make each tragedy most successful from a dramatic point of view. In a sense, then, each may be said to have an independent existence apart from its connection with the trilogy. In fact, I believe that Aeschylus consciously endeavored to produce in the *Choephoroe* and in the *Eumenides* dramas that would be intelligible without reference to the preceding plays of the trilogy. I say " consciously " because of the summaries of preceding tragedies that he provided in each. Lines 132 ff. of the *Choephoroe* which contain the first summary of the *Agamemnon* are dramatically unnecessary. The chorus, the divine powers, and the shade of Agamemnon whom Electra addresses, know the facts she recounts. If the purpose of the poet here was to appeal to the emotions of the spectators through the sorrowful musings of Electra, he expressed himself less happily than was his wont. The entire passage is explanatory in tone. Similarly, in the *Eumenides* (458–461), the first summary of the *Agamemnon* is dramatically superfluous. Had Aeschylus not wished to make the *Eumenides* a complete dramatic entity, he might easily have represented Athena

as omniscient, although actually in this play, she does seem palpably lacking in the highest attributes of divinity. Orestes relates to her the experiences of his past, as if she were not in truth a very goddess who heard his prayers from the Scamander.[1] Deities in the epic and in tragedy, it is true, never have their omniscience forced upon them, but they seldom manifest the incredible ignorance of which Athena is guilty.

To summarize, therefore, the points thus far emphasized, the constructive power of Aeschylus is admirable as revealed in the exposition of the *Oresteia*. He did not think of each play as absolutely unrelated to the others of the group, for he associated them closely. The direct allusions forward and back to each tragedy demand for an appreciation of their full significance an accurate knowledge of the entire trilogy. The poet was also exceedingly interested in depicting the evolution of character in the different plays of the trilogy. At the same time, he was careful to make each play an intelligible dramatic entity without reference to the others of the group. He further provided in each a summary or summaries of preceding dramas. He did not clear up in the following plays of the trilogy points left obscure in preceding plays. He did not attempt to illuminate the period of time that elapses between the plays. He manipulated the plot and characterization in each tragedy so skilfully as to endow each with a distinct and highly effective dramatic atmosphere of its own. The *Oresteia*, accordingly, is not really analogous to a play like *Milestones*,[2] which has been compared to a Greek trilogy. In *Milestones*, it is true, there is a long interval between the acts. But Act II explains what has occurred between the end of Act I and the beginning of Act II. It gives no résumé of Act I, nor would Act II be intelligible without Act I.[3] The true relation between the three plays of the *Oresteia* has been admirably expressed in a recent comment made by Wilamowitz:[4] " Wenn der Dichter die Kraft besass, jedes der drei Dramen zur vollen Selbständigkeit auszugestalten und doch die drei inhaltlich, bis zu

---

[1] *Eum.* 397–398.

[2] By Arnold Bennett and Edward Knoblauch, New York, 1912.

[3] For a play of the same unique structure which seems less widely known, cf. Georg Hirschfeld's *Agnes Jordan*, Berlin, 1898. Act I takes place in 1865; Act II in 1873; Act III in 1882; Act IV 5 days after Act III; Act V in 1896.

[4] *Aischylos Interpretationen*, Berlin, 1914, p. 51.

einem gewissen Grade auch formell, als eine Einheit erscheinen zu lassen, wie wir es an der *Orestie* bewundern, so war das dramatische und tragische Kunst in erhöhter Potenz."

Wilamowitz, however, does not analyze from this point of view the single plays or fragments of other trilogies which have survived.[1] Were they similarly constructed? Conjectures dealing with the subject-matter of lost trilogies have always been extremely contradictory. I shall endeavor not to add to the imbroglio, but simply to point out the conclusions which may be drawn from extant plays or fragments in regard to exposition in the trilogy.

2. *The Supplices*

The *Supplices*, like the *Agamemnon* and the *Choephoroe*, looks forward to the next play of its trilogy. The herald announces (934–937) that Ares does not try this case by witnesses, and that before he settles it, many a man is to fall and shuffle off his life. Whether this has reference to a battle that is to take place in the interval between the plays,[2] or to the murder of the sons of Aegyptus by the Danaids, it is to be interpreted as a preparation for another play of the group. The lines in which the maidens state that they have boding fears of bloody wars (1043–1044) are similarly prophetic. Here the poet did not provide a summary of the plot of the next play, like the lucid résumé of the *Choephoroe* contained in the *Agamemnon*, but he paved the way for the succeeding drama in much the same way as he prepared for the *Eumenides* at line 924 of the *Choephoroe*. Another probable allusion to the events of the next play occurs in the passage (938–939) where

---

[1] But cf. his observations on the *Persae* (*Die Perser des Aischylos*, *Hermes* XXXII, 1897, p. 397): Auch die *Perser* haben drei Acte, deren grosse Selbständigkeit klar geworden sein wird. Denke man sich jeden von diesen in der Weise ausgedehnt wie die *Hiketiden* und etwa für das Mittelstück einen weiblichen Chor, etwa die *Choephoren*, die mit der Königin zum Opfer kommen, so hat man eine Trilogie im Sinne der ältesten Tragödie." Cf. *Interpretationen*, p. 51: " an den *Persern* aber ist besonders merkwürdig, dass sie selbst der trilogischen Weise entsprechend komponiert sind."

[2] Rather than in the following play, if this was the *Aegyptii*. Cf. Wilamowitz, *Interpretationen*, p. 20; Wecklein, *Äschylos Die Schutzflehenden*, Leipzig, 1902, Introduction, p. 16. Wecklein, however, like Hermann, names the *Thalamopoeoe* as the second play of the trilogy.

Pelasgus tells the herald that in time he and his fellow-travellers will learn his name. The example of the *Oresteia* would lead us to expect at the end of the *Supplices* a reference to the following play of the trilogy. The division of the chorus is not in itself necessarily significant, if the similar ending of the *Septem*, the last of its trilogy, is genuine, as I would maintain.[1] But a succeeding play is certainly suggested in the passage (1034–1042) in which one-half of the chorus sing the praises of holy love, whether it is a defence of the conduct of Hypermnestra in saving Lynceus,[2] or a vindication of the crime of the Danaids in slaying the sons of Aegyptus, as a protest against a marriage where there is no love.[3]

The *Supplices* contains no allusion to a preceding play. It is the opinion of Schlegel[4] that this drama is the second of its trilogy, and that the poet was at fault because he connected it in no way with the preceding (or following !) play. But the *Choephoroe*, the *Eumenides*, and the *Septem*[5] consistently refer back to and give a summary of the preceding plays. Hence, it is a plausible argument for assigning the *Supplices* to the first place in the trilogy that it alludes to the events of no preceding drama. Wecklein,[6] Tucker,[7] and Wilamowitz[8] place it first in the trilogy.

The *Danaides* is generally assigned to the third place in the trilogy, although the opinions of scholars in regard to its subject-matter differ greatly. But Hermann is right in maintaining that much in this play must have been narrated.[9] Most scholars who have attempted to reconstruct this trilogy forget that the lyrical element so predominates in the *Supplices*, that for the other plays of the group any complication of plot is unimaginable. The *Supplices* itself, the first of the trilogy,

---

[1] Cf. below, pp. 218 ff.

[2] Cf. *Prometheus*, 865–867:

$$\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\nu\ \acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\rho\sigma\varsigma\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\xi\epsilon\iota\ \tau\grave{\sigma}\ \mu\grave{\eta}$$
$$\kappa\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\upsilon\nu\sigma\nu,\ \grave{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'\ \grave{\alpha}\pi\alpha\mu\beta\lambda\upsilon\nu\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$$
$$\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\nu.$$

[3] Cf. *Supp.* 393–395.

[4] *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, London, 1889, p. 90.

[5] Cf. below, pp. 160 ff.   [6] *Op. cit.*, Introduction, p. 15.

[7] *The Supplices of Aeschylus*, London, 1889, Introduction, p. xxiv.

[8] *Aischylos Interpretationen*, Berlin, 1914, p. 19.

[9] *De Aeschyli Danaidibus*, *Opuscula* ii, Leipzig, 1827, p. 323.

represents only the result of a catastrophe. The *Aegyptii*, too, may have been similarly constructed. I also doubt whether the *Danaides*, produced at a time when the drama was still exceedingly lyrical in character, revealed more than the result of the murderous deed of the Danaids. The preserved fragment,[1] containing Aphrodite's eloquent description of the power of love, points to a defence of all the Danaids, forced into a marriage they abhor, or of Hypermnestra who alone spared her husband for the reason suggested in this passage and elsewhere.[2] In either case, the third play of the trilogy must have contained a summary of the events of the two preceding plays. *Fragment 43*, which seems to refer to the awakening of the bridal couples in the morning, probably formed part of a narrative, as Wilamowitz suggests,[3] although this interpretation of the Greek is difficult. For this play I do not see how it is possible to regard the passage in any other light. Like the *Prometheus* and the *Eumenides*, the *Danaides* must have been concerned chiefly with the elucidation and reproduction of the past. It is likely that it reiterated some of the information provided in the *Supplices*. Pelasgus, having explained (*Supp.* 249–253) his identity for the benefit of the Danaids, reserves (*Supp.* 938–939) the repetition of that information for the satisfaction of Aegyptus's sons until a later occasion. If Hermann's emendation of καί for ἤ in Strabo, 5, 222,[4] is correct, then Aeschylus in the *Danaides* stated that the Pelasgians came from the Argos near Mycenae. This would imply an allusion in the third play of the trilogy to facts already related in the *Supplices* (249 ff.).

3. The Persae

It is the opinion of Wilamowitz [5] and of Wecklein [6] that the *Persae* is in no way to be associated with the other plays of its trilogy. It is true that neither the *Persae* itself nor the fragments assigned to the trilogy bear out the supposition that the group was as intimately

---

[1] Aesch. *Frag.* 44.
[2] Cf. above, p. 157.
[3] *Aischylos Interpretationen*, pp. 21–22.
[4] Aesch. *Frag.*, 46.
[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 51.
[6] *Über eine Trilogie des Aeschylos und über die Trilogie überhaupt, Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und historischen Classe der kön. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, 1891, p. 375.

related in subject-matter as the *Agamemnon*, the *Choephoroe*, and the *Eumenides*. But several passages show that the poet was careful to establish a clear connection between the plays.

There is a probable allusion to the third play of the trilogy in the passage (803–820) where Darius prophesies the disaster to come at Plataea. It has been conjectured that the *Glaucus Potnieus* dealt with the battle of Plataea.[1] Indeed, Darius utters this foreboding of the future with such meticulous detail that, with all due allowance for the constant play to Greek sympathies that mars the *Persae*, it seems a deliberate anticipation of events described in the next play of the trilogy. The fragments of the *Glaucus Potnieus* are certainly suggestive from this point of view.[2] Glaucus, himself a Boeotian, perhaps described the battle as he saw it.

The passages that mention oracles[3] allude plainly, as it seems to me, to a preceding play.[4] Now there is nothing obscure in the allusions to oracles in the *Persae*, yet their full significance for this play is not entirely clear. When Darius hears of the disaster at Salamis, he refers (739–740) to oracles which have been fulfilled in Xerxes's defeat. The *Persae* has no earlier mention of oracles. Was this point elucidated in the first play of the trilogy? From the analogy of the *Oresteia*, I think it must have been. Since this matter of the oracles is emphasized, the poet obviously regarded it as important. But the new details in regard to the past set forth in the second and in the third play of the *Oresteia* are comparatively negligible. None of them approximate in importance the oracles in the *Persae*. Furthermore, it is inconceivable that a Greek dramatist should make a sudden allusion to the fulfillment of oracles, the real nature and significance of which is left obscure throughout the play. The avoidance of dramatic surprises, as far as the spectators are concerned, is a characteristic of Greek tragedy. The audience, like an Elizabethan audience,

---

[1] Cf. Ahrens, *Aeschyli Tragoediae Septem et Perditarum Fragmenta*, Paris, 1864, pp. 195–196; Lewis Campbell, *A Guide to Greek Tragedy*, London, 1891, pp. 158–159.

[2] Aesch. *Frag.*, 37, 38, 39.

[3] *Pers.* 739–740; 800–802; 829–831.

[4] Welcker (*Die Aeschylische Trilogie*, Darmstadt, 1824, p. 478) comments on *Pers.* 739, and its conjectural relation to the *Phineus*, but does not give reasons for his theory, in addition to the prophetic gift of Phineus.

is usually let into a secret early in the play.[1] Lines 739–740 of the *Persae* have a striking resemblance to line 928 of the *Choephoroe*, where Clytaemnestra comprehends at last the real meaning of her dream, the details of which are given earlier in the play. In the same way, the nature of these oracles which is not explained in the *Persae*, must have been set forth in the first play of the trilogy, although probably their complete meaning was not apparent until lines 739–740 of the *Persae* were spoken by Darius. Aeschylus apparently used the same dramatic device in the *Septem*.[2]

4. The Septem

The analogy of the *Oresteia* applies more perfectly to the *Septem*, perhaps because the three plays of this trilogy were more closely connected in plot than the *Phineus*, the *Persae*, and the *Glaucus Potnieus*. The *Septem*, like the *Eumenides*, contains summaries of the first two plays of the trilogy. Lines 742–757 set forth in brief an essential feature of the *Laius* and possibly part of the *Oedipus*. Lines 772–791 furnish a detailed résumé of the *Oedipus*. There are also definite allusions to the events of the preceding play. Like the references in the *Oresteia* to preceding plays, these are clear in their context, but require for an understanding of their full significance knowledge of the other plays of the group. Such is the mention of the cause of the curse in line 786, a specific reference which, although not absolutely obscure, must have been previously explained. Similarly, in several passages relating to the curse,[3] the echoes of Oedipus's own voice must have

---

[1] In the *Choephoroe*, the spectators saw Orestes place the lock of hair on his father's tomb so that they did not share the bewilderment of Electra when she discovers it. Similarly, in the *Electra* of Sophocles, Orestes prepares the way for Chrysothemis's discovery by announcing that he will place a lock of hair on his father's tomb. Again, Orestes directs the paedagogus to deceive the murderers by telling them that Orestes perished in a chariot race. The audience, accordingly, knew that his narrative is false. In the *Philoctetes*, there is a similar preparation in the prologue for the false tale of Neoptolemus to Philoctetes that he was enraged at the award of the armor of Achilles to Odysseus. In the *Iphigenia at Aulis*, the spectators were informed in the prologue of the contents of the letter which Agamemnon wishes to send to Clytaemnestra at Argos, so that when Menelaus wrests the letter from the paedagogus, they knew its contents.

[2] Cf. below, pp. 161 ff.

[3] Cf. 69–70; 653–655; 727–733.

rung with dreadful clearness in the ears of many in the audience. The allusions to the Sphinx [1] also have a reminiscent tone like the repeated mention of the bath and the net in the *Oresteia*. Most interesting, however, is Eteocles's exclamation soon after he learns that Polynices is at the seventh gate (710–711): "Too true the phantoms that come in dreams, visions dividing our father's substance." Since this is the first mention of dreams in the *Septem*, they must have received fuller treatment in the preceding play, to which this passage alludes, as Hermann first observed.[2] But the method of exposition adopted here by the poet deserves further comment. These lines are but one of the many suggestions in the *Septem* [3] that the curse of Oedipus was originally phrased in a cryptic manner. Although its baneful character was probably clear, its real significance does not become apparent until Eteocles knows that he must confront his brother. Lines 727 ff. perhaps reproduce the symbolism of the dreams. The stranger from Scythia, the mediator between the brothers, is now revealed as a sword of iron. In lines 710–711, then, as in the references to the oracles in the *Persae*, the gradual method of exposition, so characteristic of the separate plays, is applied to the trilogy.

Fragment 173 apparently relates the circumstances of the murder of Laius. Hermann [4] refers the passage to the *Glaucus Potnieus*, but the mention of crossroads is certainly more suggestive of the death of Laius. Furthermore, the region of Potniae seems to have been sacred to the Erinyes. In the *Orestes* [5] of Euripides, they are called πότνιάδες θεαί. The meeting of father and son at a spot sacred to the Erinyes would be deeply significant. Besides, an event of so much importance as the murder of Laius must have taken place in the first play of the trilogy. What would be the catastrophe of that tragedy, if it were not the death of the king? Aeschylus, in a trilogy produced as late as this, would scarcely represent an event of such moment as occurring in the interval of time which elapses between the end of the *Laius* and the beginning of the *Oedipus*. If, then, this fragment is properly

---

[1] Cf. 541; 558; 776–777.
[2] *De Aeschyli Trilogiis Thebanis, Opuscula* vii, Leipzig, 1839, p. 190.
[3] Cf. 727–733; 788–790; 816–818; 877–878; 884–885; 907–908; 942–944.
[4] *Op cit.*, p. 195.
[5] 318.

assigned by Valckenaer to the *Oedipus*,[1] the second play of the trilogy
contained a recapitulation of the chief event of the *Laius*.

5. *The Prometheus*

The *Prometheus* outlines the plot of the following play of the trilogy,
in the announcement of Hermes (1020–1029) that Prometheus after
long concealment shall come forth into the light.   Then the eagle of
Zeus shall feed upon his liver, and there shall be no end to the woe
until a god shall be willing, by a vicarious sacrifice, to take Prome-
theus's place in Hades.   The observation of Hephaestus (27) that the
one to release Prometheus has not yet been born, also anticipates
the events of the next play.   Wilamowitz[2] reads a reference to the
appearance of Heracles in the *Prometheus Solutus* on his way to the
Hesperides into the lines that mention (349 ff.) Atlas and Typhon.[3]

But the *Prometheus* probably refers to no preceding play.   Lines
199 ff. should not be regarded as a review of any preceding drama.
The poet did not go into such unnecessary detail in the summaries of
preceding plays that he provided in the *Choephoroe*, the *Eumenides*,
and the *Septem*.   Furthermore, in these lines he would scarcely provide
a full résumé of a preceding play of the trilogy, and then recapitulate
(436–506) by describing minutely the pitiable condition of mankind
before Prometheus brought them the gift of fire.   Welcker reconstructs[4]
from lines 555 ff. the third episode or end of the *Prometheus Ignifer*
which he believes was the first play of the trilogy.   The Oceanids
contrast their sympathy for the present sufferings of Prometheus with
the joyful songs that they sang on the occasion of his marriage with
Hesione.   But quite apart from the doubtful question as to whether
Aeschylus would use the same chorus in two plays of the same trilogy,
the actual dramatic representation of the marriage in an Aeschylean
play is unimaginable.   This passage, like the marvelous description of

---

[1] It may, however, have formed part of the *Laius* itself.

[2] *Aischylos Interpretationen*, p. 122.

[3] Caution must be exercised in interpreting the idle threats of Prometheus as
as really foreshadowing the future.   Cf. 755–756 and 958–959 which, if taken as
definite references to succeeding plays, would be inconsistent with the outline pro-
vided by Hermes (1020–1029).

[4] *Die Aeschylische Trilogie*, p. 11.

the sacrifice of Iphigenia in the *Agamemnon*, is not to be interpreted as an allusion to the events of any preceding play. Both illustrate the poet's skill in vividly reproducing the past in choral passages.[1] If the scholion on verse 94 of the *Prometheus*[2] is not corrupt, the *Prometheus Ignifer* must have been the third play of the trilogy. The theory that it represented the founding of a cult of Prometheus the Fire-Bringer is very tempting.[3] The fragments of the *Aetnaeae*, the *Bassarides*, the *Edoni*, and the *Cabiri* show Aeschylus's fondness for a local cult.

The *Prometheus Solutus* seems to have contained a definite allusion to facts related in the preceding tragedy. In *Fragment* 194, Prometheus is evidently recounting the benefits that he conferred upon humanity, — a tale already twice-told in the *Prometheus*. The repetition, however, is justified by the new chorus of Titans. Since they are now released from Tartarus, the information set forth in lines 221–223 of the preceding play was perhaps reiterated. There Prometheus states that through his schemes Zeus was enabled to bury Kronos and his allies in the depths of Tartarus. The last play of the triology, to judge from *Fragment* 208 a, must have alluded to preceding tragedies. Here Aeschylus stated that Prometheus was in fetters for three myriads of years. The discrepancy between this statement and that given in lines 93–95 of the Prometheus[4] is surely not important. Both numbers are loosely used to express a long period of time.[5] Westphal[6] thinks that *Fragment* 208[7] has reference to the secret[8] finally divulged to Zeus in the *Prometheus Ignifer*. If so, the play must have contained passages reminiscent of Prometheus's obstinate refusal to enlighten Zeus in the first play of the trilogy.

[1] Cf. below, pp. 203 ff.

[2] Aesch. *Frag.* 208 a: ἐν γὰρ τῷ πυρφόρῳ τρεῖς μυριάδας φησὶ [Αἰσχύλος] δεδέσθαι αὐτόν.

[3] Cf. R. Westphal, *Prolegomena zu Aeschylos Tragödien*, Leipzig, 1896, pp. 220–222.

[4] δέρχηθ' οἵαις αἰκίαισιν
διακναιόμενος τὸν μυριετῆ
χρόνον ἀθλεύσω.

[5] Wilamowitz (*Aischylos Interpretationen*, pp. 125–126) points out other chronological difficulties presented by the *Prometheus*.

[6] *Op. cit.*, pp. 217–218.

[7] σιγῶν θ'ὅπου δεῖ καὶ λέγων τὰ καίρια.   [8] Cf. below, pp. 195 ff.

6. *The Myrmidones, the Nereides, and the Phryges*

It is generally acknowledged that the *Myrmidones*, the *Nereides*, and the *Phryges* formed a trilogy. The subject-matter of each play has been plausibly reconstructed, with considerable uniformity in regard to the chief events of each.[1] In the second play of the trilogy, Thetis is thought to have appeared with armor for her son in answer to his prayers. A preparation for the arrival of Thetis may be recognized in the fragment from the *Myrmidones*[2] where Achilles, as it seems, exclaims ὅπλων ὅπλων δεῖ. The *Nereides* must also have dealt with the death of Hector. *Fragments* 265 and 266 of the *Phryges*, then, which apparently refer to the dead Hector, and are assigned by Wecklein to Priam and by Croiset to Hermes, point very plainly to a reference back to the events of the *Nereides* and possibly of the *Myrmidones*. *Fragment* 490 which Wecklein assigns to the *Phryges*, and which may well have been uttered by Priam, may allude to the bravery of Hector, with special reference to the death of Patroclus. The third play of the trilogy perhaps summarized the chief events of the *Myrmidones* and of the *Nereides*.

7. *The Armorum Iudicium, the Threissae, and the Salaminiae*

To a connected group are also assigned the *Armorum Iudicium*, the *Threissae*, and the *Salaminiae*.[3] *Fragment* 177 from the *Armorum Iudicium*, τί γὰρ καλὸν ζῆν ᾧ βίος λύπας φέρει; is prophetic of the catastrophe of the following play of the trilogy which contained the death of Ajax.[4] The scholiast[5] on verse 134 of Sophocles's *Ajax*

[1] Cf. Hermann, *De Aeschyli Myrmidonibus, Nereidibus, Phrygibus Dissertatio, Opuscula* v, Leipzig, 1834, pp. 136–163; Welcker, *Die Aeschylische Trilogie*, pp. 415 ff.; Wecklein, *Über eine Trilogie des Aeschylos und über die Trilogie überhaupt, Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und historischen Classe der kön. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, 1891, pp. 327–385; Croiset, *Eschyle Imitateur d'Homère dans Les Myrmidons, Les Néréides, Les Phrygiens, Revue des Études Grecques* vii, 1894, pp. 151–180.

[2] Aesch. *Frag.* 140.

[3] Cf. Welcker, *Op. cit.*, pp. 438 ff.; Hermann, *De Aeschyli Tragoediis Fata Aiacis et Teucri Complexis, Opuscula* vii, Leipzig, 1839, pp. 362–387.

[4] Cf. Aesch. *Frag.*, 83.

[5] τὸ δὲ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων κηδεμονικὸν μέν, ὡς Αἰσχύλος ἐν Θρήσσαις, οὐ μὴν εὐπρόσωπον. ὅρα γὰρ οἷον αἰχμαλώτους ἐπιτιμᾶν τῷ Μενελάῳ.

informs us that in the *Threissae* the chorus of captives inveighed against the part taken by Menelaus in the award of the armor. This implies a reference to the events of the first play of the trilogy. The *Salaminiae* is conjectured, and I think rightly, to have told how Teucer brought to Telamon the news of the death of Ajax. It must, therefore, have provided a summary of the first and of the second plays of the trilogy, in order that the circumstances leading up to the suicide of Ajax might be made known to Telamon. The *Salaminiae* would thus conform to the practice of Aeschylus in the third plays of other trilogies already discussed.

The conclusions, therefore, drawn in regard to the interrelation of the plays of the *Oresteia*, are confirmed rather than contradicted by an examination of other connected groups. Of course, all trilogies, the plays of which were related in subject-matter, cannot have been so carefully constructed as the *Oresteia*, but the plays of the other trilogies are unmistakably cast in an analogous mould.

II. Exposition in the Separate Plays

In order to appreciate the methods of exposition that the Greek poets used in the separate plays, each being considered as an intelligible dramatic entity, it is necessary to understand the peculiar character of ancient dramaturgy. The admiration that Horace expresses [1] for the skill displayed by Homer at the beginning of the *Odyssey* because

> "Semper ad eventum festinat, et in medias res
> Nec secus ac notas, auditorem rapit,"

he must have felt also for the tragic poets of the fifth century before Christ. Indeed, the successful playwright, even more conspicuously than the epic poet, must skilfully condense the mass of material available for literary treatment. Certainly the Greek dramatists of this period were careful to obey a more or less conventional canon which demanded that the poet should present to his audience merely the culminating moments of his plot. This phenomenon, so far as I can discover, was first commented upon by Dryden. [2] "This rule of time," he remarks, "how well it has been observed by the ancients,

[1] *Ars Poetica*, 148–149.
[2] *Essays on the Drama*, New York, 1898, *The Essay of Dramatic Poetry*, pp. 19–20.

most of their plays will witness; you see them in their tragedies (wherein to follow this rule is certainly most difficult) from the very beginning of their plays, falling close into that part of the story which they intend for the action or principal object of it, leaving the former part to be delivered by narration; so that they set the audience, as it were, at the part where the race is to be concluded, and saving them the tedious expectation of seeing the poet set out and ride the beginning of the course, they suffer you not to behold him till he is in sight of the goal and just upon you." The principle has also been discussed in detail by Professor Post.[1] For a study of exposition in Greek tragedy this method of construction is very important. Since, in a Greek play, the spectators saw acted upon the stage what would constitute simply Act III of a modern drama, somehow in the course of the play, it was necessary for the ancient poet to reveal the cause of the catastrophe, — the normal subject-matter of Acts I and II in a modern play. At the same time, it was necessary for him to show extraordinary skill in condensation, if he were to define adequately for his audience characters who appear only at the climax of their existence.

Shakespeare reverts to the Greek method conspicuously in *The Tempest* and in *Hamlet*, and in many of the historical plays, for example, in *King Henry IV, Part I*. Here, as in the case of a Greek tragedy, considerable retrospect is necessary to make the situation clear. But in general, his tragedies, as well as his comedies, demand no formal exposition of the past, beyond the explanation of a few facts that may be made plain in a very few lines, after the delivery of which the drama of the present promptly begins to develop. For the Greek dramatist, however, any development of plot, such as we find in Shakespeare, was out of the question, since the former presented to his audience simply the catastrophe, thrusting into the past all the causes in their actual operation. A good example of the difference between the Greek and the ordinary modern method is Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, a play which at first sight seems analogous to a Greek tragedy because Shakespeare, like the Greek dramatist, could assume that his audience, before the presentation of the tragedy, had a general

---

[1] C. R. Post, *The Dramatic Art of Aeschylus*, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XVI, 1905, pp. 15–61.

knowledge of the characters and events to be depicted. But whereas a Greek poet in *Julius Caesar* would have shown as part of the action of the drama simply the murder of Caesar, Shakespeare portrayed as part of the drama of the present all the events leading up to the catastrophe, — the assembling of the crowd to witness his triumph, and every detail of the growth of the conspiracy against him, all of which a Greek poet would have thrust into the past.

Modern writers on dramatic technique and composition have not been slow to recognize in Ibsen the modern protagonist of the Greek method of dramatic construction.[1] Upon first consideration it might seem that the problem of elucidating the past was for Ibsen a more difficult one than for the Greek poet, since the latter could assume for his audience familiarity with at least the general outlines of the myths, whereas the modern playwright who adopts the Greek method must explicitly make all the circumstances of the past intelligible. It is undoubtedly true that the Greek poet did take it for granted that his audience was conversant with many details of the myths from which he chose material for his dramas;[2] at the same time, it is quite possible to exaggerate the amount of preliminary information that the spectators were supposed to possess. Antiphanes, to be sure, insists[3] that tragedy is far easier to write than comedy, because in tragedy the story is already familiar to the audience. Aristotle, however, gives us the serious antithesis to this observation of the comic poet by remarking[4] that the best known of the myths were familiar only to a few.[5] Furthermore, even a superficial survey of extant Greek tragedy reveals great divergence in the treatment of the old legends by the

[1] *Innocent*, a play by George Broadhurst, produced in New York in 1915, is an extreme instance of a modern revival of the Greek method. In the prologue of this play, which is founded on the Hungarian drama of Arpad Pasztor, the guardian of McCormick's daughter, Innocent, commits suicide. The ensuing acts explain the reason for his death.

[2] Cf. below, pp. 170 ff.

[3] T. Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig, 1884, Vol. II, p. 90, *Frag.* 191.

[4] *Poetics*, 9, 8, 1451 b.

[5] If this statement of Aristotle's is based on an intimate knowledge of Greek tragedy, then the plays of Aeschylus certainly must have been written for the cultured few! But how could the drama by the time of Aristotle have been so esoteric in its character?

individual poet. It was perhaps a point of professional pride for poets, while observing the traditional outlines of the myths, τοὺς μὲν παρειλημμένους μύθους, as Aristotle puts it,[1] to vary details in as original a manner as was possible. The Greek dramatist, accordingly, was no less handicapped than the modern playwright who plunges *in medias res*, as far as the clear exposition of the past is concerned. If the latter is hampered by the necessity of explaining to his audience all the facts of the past, the former, although he could depend upon his audience's knowledge of what might be called the " scenario " of the play, may well have felt with Horace,

<p style="text-align:center">" Difficile est proprie communia dicere."</p>

I do not agree, however, with Professor Post in his essay on Aeschylus[2] to which I have already referred, where, in discussing the numerous versions of a given myth, he observes:[3] " So, in the end, if the knowledge that the people already possessed of the myths made any difference at all, instead of giving the authors any advantage, it rather made it all the more imperative that each dramatist should render unmistakable the manner which he individually chose to pursue." In the first place, there *were* advantages for the ancient poet in the assumption of preliminary knowledge for the spectators.[4] In the second place, Aeschylus, at any rate, seems not to have been at all concerned with making plain his particular version of the forms of a given myth known in his day.[5]

1. Exposition in the Parodos or Prologue

The first question to be considered in examining the exposition in the separate plays is whether the situation at the beginning of each drama is sufficiently clear. The parodos of the *Supplices* (1–39) contains enough explanatory matter to make intelligible the succeeding action of the drama. The audience is informed of the personnel of the chorus, the place of the dramatic action, and the point in the myth at which the play begins. Much of this exposition in a modern play could be dispensed with, because it would have already been com-

---

[1] Poetics, 14, 5, 1454 a.
[2] *Harvard Studies in Class. Phil.*, Vol. XVI, 1905, pp. 15–61.
[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 23–24.   [4] Cf. below, pp. 196 ff.   [5] Cf. below, pp. 210 ff.

municated to the spectators in the program. But in the absence of this
modern convenience in Aeschylus's time, the suppliant maidens must
needs speak openly of themselves (1–10), state their father's name
(11), and announce that the soil on which they stand is Argive.
Euripides, in general, adopted an equally direct method of establish-
ing the identity of characters who appear in the opening scene, as
Von Arnim has observed.[1] Frantz has shown [2] that Sophocles was
similarly careful about this point. Owing to the lack of a curtain,
the chorus of the *Supplices* cannot be " discovered " grouped as sup-
pliants about the altars of the gods, as the curtain rises; hence, they
must state that they are suppliants (21) before they turn to their
prayers.[3] The spectators further learned what part of the myth re-
lating to the Danaids was to be treated in this play. Although the
poet did not state openly whether the betrothal of the Danaids to the
sons of Aegyptus had already taken place, yet he made it plain that
departure from Egypt or acquiescence in the marriage was necessary.

The method that Aeschylus used to disclose antecedent circum-
stances in the parodos of the *Supplices* is interesting because it is
precisely the same that Euripides adopted in his formal prologues.[4]
Everything that relates to the past is frankly set forth with no attempt
at gradual elucidation or natural dramatic action to accompany the
necessary explanation of the situation. This mode of exposition may
seem to have a legitimate excuse since the Danaids are strangers in
a strange land, and yet from the later plays of Aeschylus it is evident
that the poet did not regard such open explanations at the beginning

---

[1] *De Prologorum Euripideorum Arte et Interpretatione*, Greifswald, 1882, p. 82:
" In eis fabulis omnibus quae ante Siculam expeditionem actae sunt primis statim
versibus persona προλογίζουσα quae sit significat; neglegentiorem se gessit Euripides
in fabulis quas post illam scripsit;" pp. 83–84: " Locum actionis intra procemium
indicatur notaturque pronomine ὅδε."

[2] *De Comoediae Atticae Prologis*, Treves, 1891, p. 68: " Sophocles quinque in
tragoediis ita instituit ut altera duarum personarum quae primae in scaenam pro-
grediuntur ordiatur ab alterius nomine proferendo; paulo post illa respondet et
plane eodem modo in responsi initio illius nomen ponit."

[3] Similarly, the fettering of Prometheus in full view of the audience forms part
of the dramatic action of the *Prometheus*.

[4] Throughout this paper I have used the word " prologue " in its Aristotelian
sense. Cf. Poetics, 12, 2, 1452 b: ἔστιν δὲ πρόλογος μὲν μέρος ὅλον τραγῳδίας τὸ πρὸ
χοροῦ παρόδου.

of a drama as either necessary or artistic. The Danaids, however, from the time that they first appear upon the scene, reveal their terror and their reverent trust in Zeus, and, accordingly, seem more lifelike than many of the speakers in the prologues of Euripides who often display no emotion. Whether Thespis[1] or another ingenious dramatist, possibly Phrynichus, was the inventor of the prologue, it is easy to see how it was the natural development from a drama beginning, like the *Supplices*, with a chorus explaining immediately after its entrance all the circumstances antecedent to the action of the drama proper. Later, when the appearance of an actor preceded that of the chorus, the explanatory remarks of the chorus were naturally transferred to his lips without any necessary modification of the formal substance of the opening lines.

The situation at the beginning of the *Supplices* is, as I have said, clear, — that is, the poet gave his audience all the facts of the past which it was necessary for them to know in order to understand the rest of the play. But I am sure that he assumed that his audience was familiar with some details of the myth to which he might safely refer without immediate explanation. The allusions (15 ff.) to the descent of the Danaids from the heifer would be sheer nonsense to an audience that had no preliminary knowledge of the transformation of Io. It is true, however, that in lines 291 ff. the story of Io is told in great detail. We are, therefore, confronted with the question whether Aeschylus deliberately adopted here the gradual method of exposition for the myth, so that it is not necessary to suppose that the references at lines 15 ff. were perfectly lucid to his audience. The distributive method of exposition was characteristic of Aeschylus and skilfully manipulated by him.[2] But he did not make use of it in instances where ambiguity would result in the allusions leading up to complete elucidation. Here, then, I should say that the poet believed that the references at lines 15 ff. would be sufficiently intelligible to his audience, so that he might reserve for the proper dramatic moment the revelation of the details in the myth of Io.

---

[1] Cf. Themistius, *Orat.* 26, 316 d, p. 382, ed. Dindorf, Leipzig, 1832: καὶ οὐ προσέχομεν Ἀριστοτέλει ὅτι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὁ χορὸς εἰσιὼν ᾖδεν εἰς τοὺς θεούς, Θέσπις δὲ πρόλογόν τε καὶ ῥῆσιν ἐξεῦρεν.

[2] Cf. below, pp. 192 ff.

Sophocles, like Aeschylus, assumed that the spectators were conversant with the outlines of the myths that he treated in his dramas. In the *Philoctetes* (72–73), and in the *Ajax* (1111–1114), he plainly took it for granted that his audience was familiar with the story of the oath by which the suitors of Helen had sworn to her father Tyndareus that they would help Menelaus if he were robbed of her. Otherwise, the observations of Odysseus and Teucer respectively would have been meaningless. In the *Antigone*, also, (1303) it is evident that the spectators were supposed to know about the heroic sacrifice of Megareus. Line 552 of the *Oedipus Coloneus* shows that they must have been familiar with the circumstances attending the blinding of Oedipus. The allusion to the unnamed master of Heracles in lines 35–36 of the *Trachiniae*, as well as the subsequent mention (1049) of the tasks imposed by Eurystheus, implies preliminary knowledge on the part of the spectators. Similarly, they would not have understood the taunting reference to Odysseus in the *Ajax* of Sophocles (190) and in *Fragment* 175 of Aeschylus, had they not known the legend that represented Sisyphus as the lover of Anticleia before her marriage to Laertes.

Euripides, also, in spite of the innumerable details that crowd his prologues, presupposed a certain degree of knowledge for his audience. In the *Electra*, for example, he certainly assumed that the spectators knew of the oracle that directed Orestes to slay his mother. This is obvious from two passages [1] that lead up to the definite mention of Apollo's dread command in lines 971–973. In like manner, in the *Andromache*, it is evident that the audience must have been familiar with the legend that represented Neoptolemus as having demanded reparation from Phoebus for his father's death.[2]

Did Aeschylus also suppose that his audience would understand the reason for the aversion of the Danaids to the marriage? This is not clearly indicated in the *Supplices*, as is proved by the contradictory conclusions of modern commentators.[3] Like the sin of Agamemnon which brought down upon his head the wrath of Artemis, it is entirely

---

[1] 87–89; 399–400.

[2] Cf. 49–55; 1002–1003; 1106–1108.

[3] Cf. G. Hermann, *De Aeschyli Danaidibus*, *Opuscula* ii, Leipzig, 1827, p. 330; W. Ridgway, *The Origin of Tragedy*, Cambridge, 1910, pp. 187–189; N. Wecklein,

ἔξω τοῦ δράματος. It is really impossible to decide whether Aeschylus thought that his audience would follow a particular version of the myth current at that time, or whether he intentionally left this point only partially explained. The matter is not, it is important to observe, of especial dramatic significance. For purposes of this play, Aeschylus needed to make plain only that the suppliant maidens find the thought of marriage with their cousins intolerable. It would never occur to us to criticize Shakespeare for not explaining in detail the reason for the enmity between the Montagues and the Capulets in *Romeo* and *Juliet*, since he made it clear that they are hostile to each other. Similarly, in the *Supplices*, Aeschylus, if he wished, might perfectly well consign the precise causes for the aversion of the Danaids to the marriage to a convenient limbo of the imagination. In the summary of the *Laius* contained in the *Septem* (742 ff.) Aeschylus did not dilate (as I believe he did not in the *Laius* itself) upon the sin of Laius which induced the prohibitive warning of the oracle, but dwelt simply upon Laius's disregard of divine admonitions. In the *Agamemnon*, the " original sin " of the race is the transgression of Atreus. The poet did not take his audience farther back into the history of the ill-fated house. Even Euripides, who was so generous with explanations, did not review the past *ad nauseam*. We do not hear in the *Alcestis* how Apollo persuaded the Fates to permit him to substitute Alcestis for Admetus. The exception that proves the rule in the case of the observation " nothing has a beginning " is beautifully illustrated in the drama, for it is absolutely necessary that a play should have a definite starting point. This, in the *Supplices*, is the arrival of the Danaids from Egypt, in flight from the hated marriage.

The situation at the beginning of the *Persae* was not so clearly outlined by the poet as in the parodos of the *Supplices*. The audience learned, to be sure, in the parodos of the *Persae* (1–64) that the chorus is composed of Persian elders whom Xerxes appointed to be guardians of the Persian kingdom in his absence (1–7), that the king has led a mighty army into Greece (12–13), and that not yet has the outcome

Studien zu den Hiketiden des Aeschylos, Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philogischen und der historischen Classe der kön. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München, 1893, *Zweiter Band*, pp. 393–450; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aischylos Interpretationen*, p. 15.

of the expedition been announced (14–15). But there is no mention
of the Persian city in which the scene of the play is laid,[1] and what is
more important, the parodos of the *Persae* does not explain the pres-
ence of the chorus. After the parodos (140 ff.), the elders, indeed,
provide an apparent explanation of their assembling together, but
this is really no explanation at all, for they represent themselves as
coming together to deliberate upon the question as to how Xerxes
fares! Naturally, they do not proceed to consider this futile topic,
and the appearance of Atossa is welcome. Now it would have been
so easy for Aeschylus to represent the elders as having come to con-
sult with Atossa at her summons that it is strange that he did not ex-
plain the appearance of the elders upon the scene of action in a really
satisfactory way. Perhaps we may see here the influence of Phrynichus
upon Aeschylus. The hypothesis of the *Persae* found in the Medicean
manuscript mentions the fact that this play is an adaptation of
Phrynichus's *Phoenissae*. It adds that the opening scene of the latter
introduced a eunuch arranging seats for a meeting of the councilors
of the Persian kingdom. Aeschylus may have incorporated into his
Persae the beginning of Phrynichus's drama. In other respects, how-
ever, he was careful not to follow the example of Phrynichus. He
adopted a chorus of men rather than of women; he dispensed with
the eunuch; he postponed the announcement of the defeat of the
Persians until later in the play. It is curious that he should not have
been equally cautious with regard to the meeting of the elders.

But in other details, the parodos of the *Persae*, as compared with
that of the *Supplices*, marks a distinct advance in the dramatic art of
Aeschylus. For one reason, it does not immediately unfold the past,
but holds a few important facts in reserve for later revelation.[2] Again,
it seems less frankly explanatory of antecedent events (although it
smacks somewhat of the formal prologue), because it surrounds the
play with the proper atmosphere at the very beginning. The vague
forebodings of disaster uttered by the chorus prepare the way for the
evil tidings to come, and strike immediately the note of despair that
is characteristic of the entire drama.

---

[1] I am unable to find in the text any statement to the effect that the scene is laid
at Susa, although commentators frequently assert this. Aeschylus perhaps had
in mind another capital city of the great Persian empire.

[2] Cf. below, pp. 193–194.

In the *Septem*, the information that the audience must have at the beginning of the play is supplied, not in a song of an entering chorus, but in a prologue divided into two parts. In the first of these (1–38), Eteocles addresses the citizens of Thebes; in the second (39–77), a messenger brings news of the Argive army to Eteocles. The situation is made clear in the first part of the prologue, if we suppose that the audience was familiar with the outlines of the myth. Eteocles names himself (6); the place of the action is fixed (1); and it is plain that after a long siege the Achaeans are now planning an attack against the city (28–29). There are several indications that Aeschylus regarded his audience as cognizant of the main facts of the myth relating to Oedipus and his house. The question is more perplexing than in the case of the *Agamemnon*, which we know was the first play of its trilogy. Of course we cannot ascertain the precise contents of the dramas that preceded the *Septem*. We need not, however, be absolutely baffled. I am convinced that Aeschylus presupposed for the spectators knowledge of the quarrel between the sons of Oedipus. They would then realize at the beginning of the play that Eteocles is defending the city against the attack of Polynices. Sidgwick [1] believes that the contention of the brothers was treated in *Oedipus*, the second play of the trilogy. But it would certainly be unlike Aeschylus to compose an *Oedipus* containing both the catastrophe of Oedipus's career and the catastrophe of his sons' quarrel, even though the latter was not treated in the same detail as the fall of Oedipus. The summary, too, of the *Oedipus* contained in the *Septem* has nothing to say of the disagreement of the brothers. The poet would scarcely have passed over this in silence, had it been a part of the preceding play. The audience must also have had preliminary knowledge of the prophecy of Amphiaraus referring to Adrastus. The messenger reports (49–51) that the Argive chiefs hung tokens for their parents on the chariot of Adrastus, an unintelligible proceeding to an audience not conversant with the prophecy foretelling the escape of Adrastus, alone of all the Argive leaders.

It is interesting to observe that Aeschylus here assumed that not only were the spectators familiar with the prophecy, but that the chiefs also knew of it. Otherwise, why did they hang tokens on the

---

[1] *Aeschylus, Septem Contra Thebas*, Oxford, 1903, Introduction, p. xvi.

chariot of Adrastus? But as Tucker[1] points out, if the Argive leaders had known that they were to die, the entire attack and the oath that they give (46–48) would be ridiculous. He suggests the possibility that the chiefs, though not convinced by the seer, yet took these precautions. But later in the play (378–379), we are told that the seer does not permit the Argives to cross the river Ismene *because the omens are unfavorable*, not because of any prophecy that they will die. If they knew of the oracle that doomed them to death, then lines 378–379 are certainly an anticlimax. Amphiaraus refers (587–588) only to his own approaching death, and nowhere in the entire drama is mention made of the impending death of the other leaders. The saner interpretation of lines 49–51 is that Aeschylus for the moment thoughtlessly assumed for some of his *dramatis personae* knowledge of facts that he might without reprehension assume for his audience. Sophocles was in like manner at fault in the *Trachiniae* (821–836), when the chorus refer to the prophecy that after twelve years the toils of Heracles should be ended. But Deianira, who first informs the chorus of the inscribed tablet that Heracles gave to her as he departed, says nothing of the oracle, and what is more important, does not refer in any way to the period of twelve years.[2] Logically, of course, the chorus should not know what Deianira does not tell them. Sophocles evidently forgot that his chorus ought not to be represented as cognizant of all the facts of the myth which he took for granted on the part of the audience.

The entire prologue of the *Septem* is constructed with a high degree of art. The first part combines with the necessary exposition natural dramatic action. Eteocles has come to direct the citizens to man the battlements in preparation for an attack. Here all purely explanatory details are reduced to a minimum, and the action begins immediately with something of the admirable swiftness of more modern productions like *Cyrano de Bergerac*. The absence of playbills, a curtain, programs, and other paraphernalia of the theatre seems to have been no drawback in the way of a display of the poet's great dramatic ability. In addition to this, the first part of the prologue, like the witches' scene in *Macbeth*, puts the spectators in the right mood by emphasizing

---

[1] *The Seven Against Thebes of Aeschylus*, Cambridge, 1908, p. 21.
[2] Cf. *Tr.* 156–158; 164–165.

immediately the tense patriotism of Eteocles. The second part of the prologue is skilfully prepared for by the first, in which Eteocles announces that he has sent forth scouts, and it does not merely repeat the details given in the first part in regard to the past, as the second part of an Euripidean prologue so often does. In the *Alcestis*, for instance, the dialogue between Thanatos and Apollo (28–76) which constitutes the second part of the prologue, although it adds the dénouement, simply repeats the explanations already given in lines 1–27. But lines 39–77 of the *Septem* relate absolutely new facts concerning antecedent circumstances, and elucidate further the information already set forth in lines 1–38. For the details about the Argive army provided in lines 39–56 are new, and line 59,

$$\text{ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἤδη πάνοπλος Ἀργείων στρατός}$$

throws light on line 28,

$$\text{λέγει μεγίστην προσβολὴν Ἀχαιίδα,}$$

in substituting the particular word Ἀργείων for the more general term Ἀχαιίδα.

This was the method of Sophocles, too, in most of his tragedies. In the *Trachiniae*, for example, the second part of the prologue begins at line 64 with the entrance of Hyllus. In the course of lines 64–93, it becomes evident that Heracles has been for many months in the service of a Lydian woman, an important fact not divulged in the first part of the prologue. Moreover, lines 64–93 clarify the preceding exposition, for lines 76–81 throw light on the rather obscure reference in lines 46–47 to the δέλτον that Heracles left with Deianira. In the *Oedipus Coloneus*, the exposition proper is transposed to the second part of the prologue. The first is a very natural and exceedingly beautiful conversation between Oedipus and Antigone.

The prologue of the *Prometheus*, like that of the *Septem*, has two parts, of which the first provides sufficient explanation of antecedent conditions. The place of action (1–2) and the speakers of the prologue (3; 12; 85) are named; the tragic situation of Prometheus at the beginning of the drama is also explained (7–8). The point in the myth at which the play opens is clear, for it is evident that Prometheus has stolen fire, and is about to submit to punishment for his daring. The information provided here is much more baldly explanatory of

the situation than that disclosed in the prologue of the *Septem*. It resembles somewhat the method used in the *Supplices* and in the *Persae*, but the dialogue form that the exposition assumes reveals a distinct improvement in dramatic technique. The ascription of the invention of the second actor to Aeschylus would point to him as the originator of this form of exposition which Sophocles used with such consummate artistry. If the *Hectoris Redemptio* of Aeschylus began not with an anapaestic parodos, but with a prologue, the latter was cast in a mould analogous to that of the *Prometheus*. But ἐν ἀρχαῖς in the βίος[1] should perhaps not be pressed to mean the prologue. In the *Prometheus*, the presence of all the characters upon the scene of action is reasonably explained, and the necessary elucidation of the past is supplied dramatically in the conversation relating to the fettering of the rebellious god. The second part of the prologue (88–127) adds several new details relating to past events. From lines 93–95 it is apparent that Prometheus knew, when he stole fire for mankind, that he must suffer for his sin thousands of years, and lines 109–111 expand the tale already told (7–8) of his misdemeanor. The effectiveness of the outburst of the impassioned Prometheus to the elements, coming as it does, after his long silence during the first part of the prologue, is one of the many instances of Aeschylus's skill in combining necessary explanation with dramatic situations of supreme power. If we may postulate for this tragedy only two speaking actors,[2] the silence of Prometheus is perhaps inevitable, but the ability of Aeschylus to make the exigencies of the Greek stage subserve the purposes of his art is none the less admirable.

In this play, also, it is plain that Aeschylus credited the spectators with knowledge of the myths that he treated. Hephaestus announces (27) to Prometheus that the one to release him has not yet been born. It would be absurd to read into this line any enigmatical allusion to the fate of Prometheus. Such surprises are not Greek;[3] besides, Hesiod had already made Heracles as the deliverer of Prometheus a familiar figure.[4] It is, therefore, unnecessary to suppose that in a

---

[1] Cf. the Αἰσχύλου βίος: ἔν τε τοῖς Ἕκτορος λύτροις Ἀχιλλεὺς ὁμοίως ἐγκεκαλυμμένος οὐ φθέγγεται, πλὴν ἐν ἀρχαῖς ὀλίγα πρὸς Ἑρμῆν ἀμοιβαῖα.

[2] But cf. K. Rees, *The So-Called Rule of Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama*, Chicago, 1908, p. 56, note 2.

[3] Cf. above, pp. 159 ff.   [4] *Theogony*, 526–527, ed. A. Rzach, Leipzig, 1913.

preceding play mention was made of a deliverer for Prometheus. More probably, Aeschylus assumed here that his audience was familiar not only with the manner of Prometheus's release, but also with the identity of his rescuer. Two passages in the play (771–774; 871–873) discuss the releaser of Prometheus, but his name is not mentioned. It is evidently a detail of the myth with which the audience was supposed to be acquainted.

The situation at the beginning of the *Agamemnon* is perfectly clear. The audience learned the identity of the speaker of the prologue (1–10), the place of the action (23–24), and the particular phase of the myth with which the plot of the play is concerned (8–10). Certain points relating to antecedent circumstances the poet explained much more carefully than in the opening scene of any of the plays hitherto discussed. The spectators were informed, not only that the place of the action is Argos (24), but also that the scene is laid at the palace of Agamemnon (3). The poet also specifically indicated (22–23) the time of the opening scene. The exposition is marvelously managed, because the musings of the watchman are dramatic as well as explanatory in character. There is a reasonable motive for his presence upon the scene of action. The business of exposition need not be immediately despatched. In this respect, the opening scene of the *Agamemnon* is more artistic than most of the prologues of Sophocles, as Wilamowitz[1] suggests: " Dagegen hat Aischylos sich sehr rasch damit befreundet, das Drama mit einem fertigen Bilde zu beginnen. Der Wächter auf dem Schlosse von Argos wird eine Weile schweigend spähen, ehe er beginnt, Orestes auf dem Grabe des Vaters sich mit seinen Weihgaben beschäftigen, ehe er heruntersteigt: die stumme Handlung macht Stimmung. So war es auch in der *Niobe* und den *Phrygern*, wo die Hauptpersonenen verhüllt auf der Bühne sassen." The prologue, moreover, contains the exciting force which sets the drama in motion, since all the events that ensue come as the inevitable result of the appearance of the signal-fire that meant the fall of Troy. It also envelops the tragedy at the very beginning with an atmosphere of mystery and gloom, by means of the naïve but deeply significant observations of the watchman. Finally, the poet's obvious interest in characterization is revealed by the manifest pains he takes to provide

---

[1] *Aischylos Interpretationen*, pp. 56–57.

the speaker, humble man though he be, with a strong individuality of
his own.

Here, if ever, the audience was supposed to have preliminary
knowledge of the myth upon which the tragedy is based. The state-
ment of the watchman (2), for example, that he has been on guard for
a year implies familiarity with the myth which told of the prophecy
that Troy would be captured in the tenth year of the war.[1] Otherwise,
the reason for the watch of a year's duration would not be clear.[2]
Obviously, Aeschylus thought it unnecessary to explain what or where
Troy was or who the Atridae were, but these are, after all, superficial
details. Others are of far more moment. For unless the poet could
be absolutely sure that the spectators knew the plot of the play before
its actual presentation in the theatre, the watchman's subtle remarks
(18–19) about the disaster that has come upon the house, no longer
managed as is best, would have been meaningless; the audience would
have lost to a lamentable degree the force of his ambiguous and
ironical characterization of Clytaemnestra (11), and would have com-
pletely failed to appreciate his loyal reticence when he learns that his
master is coming home (38–39).

In spite of the lacunae at the beginning of the *Choephoroe*, the con-
dition of affairs when the play opens is even clearer than in the pro-
logue of the *Agamemnon*. The city, to be sure, in which the action
takes place is not named, but Orestes refers (6) to the river Inachus,
and states openly (3–5; 18–19) that he has come to his father's tomb
to avenge his death. Like the prologue of the *Agamemnon*, the open-
ing scene of the *Choephoroe* is dramatic as well as expository. Orestes
is no πρόσωπον προτατικόν. He is present for a purpose, and the lock
of hair that he places on his father's tomb provides the exciting force
of the action that follows the prologue. The intensely serious and
sad temperament of Orestes is also emphasized immediately. The
assumption that the audience knew the outlines of the story to be
represented dramatically is conspicuous here as in all the plays.
Orestes does not name himself, at least in the fragmentary prologue

---

[1] Cf. Iliad, 2, 329: τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ πόλιν αἱρήσομεν εὐρυάγυιαν.

[2] But to say, as Verrall does (*The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, New York, 1904,
Introduction, p. xxxiii), that this year-long watch presupposes the adoption by
Aeschylus of the Homeric plot, as set forth in the *Odyssey*, 4, 526 ff., would be un-
justifiable.

that has come down to us. It is sufficient for him to mention (16–18) his sister Electra. At lines 20–21 the casual way in which Orestes addresses Pylades shows that by this time his companion had become a familiar if not stereotyped element of the myth. The *Choephoroe* supplies no later explanation of their relations.

The opening scene of the *Eumenides* is laid at the shrine of Apollo (34–35). The priestess of the great god is the first speaker in the prologue (29). Orestes is still pursued by the Furies (34 ff.). But the state of affairs is sufficiently lucid, only if we grant that the poet thought it superfluous to label all his *dramatis personae* for an audience familiar with the story of Orestes. He did not explain the identity of Orestes or the Erinyes. The prologue of the *Eumenides* is unique because of its quadripartite structure. Lines 1–33 contain purely expository matter; the three remaining parts [1] provide some explanatory details, but are far more skilfully constructed. It is curious to see how much the first division of the priestess's speech savors of the formal Euripidean prologue in its baldly expositional and dramatically superfluous nature. Ziel[2] has commented on the " modern " exposition of this play, but only lines 34 ff. should be so characterized. I cannot account for the lack of artistry displayed in these lines in a trilogy which is so perfect a specimen of Aeschylus's supreme ability as a dramatist in any other way than by supposing that the poet desired here to make plain his own peculiar innovations in the myth.[3] He put great emphasis upon the just succession of seers at Apollo's shrine (5 ff.), and upon the Zeus-inspired oracle of the god (17 ff.). It is easy to see the importance of these details for the *Eumenides*. The first strikes the keynote of peace that is desirable for a play in which the dread Erinyes are to undergo a transformation into kindly goddesses. The second is necessary for a clear understanding of 614 ff., where Apollo asserts that all his oracular utterances have been guided by the will of Zeus. From a dramatic point of view, however, the recital of the priestess is a blot on the artistic beauty of the play. To maintain that the speech has something of the character of the the-

---

[1] 34–63; 64–93; 94–116.

[2] *Über die dramatische Exposition. Ein Beitrag zur Technik des Dramas.* Rostock, 1869, p. 16.

[3] Cf. his description of the Furies (46 ff.), which is obviously original.

ophany in Euripides is not an adequate *apologia* for its undramatic exposition. Deities, it is true, need not be involved in dramatic business. But the additional explanations of the second part of the prologue, although they, too, proceed from the inspired lips of the priestess, assume a natural and dramatic form. As she turns away from the audience to enter the shrine, she catches sight of Orestes, and her horrified exclamations come as a result of what she has seen. The remainder of the prologue, also, consisting of the conversation between Apollo and Orestes, and Clytaemnestra's angry appeal to the sleeping Erinyes, is a reasonable part of the development of the drama of the present, and also provides the opportunity for further elucidation of the past.

To recapitulate: The situation at the beginning of all the extant plays of Aeschylus is clear, provided it is admitted that the poet presupposed for his audience a general knowledge of the myths that he used as foundation for his plots.[1] The technique of the poet reveals the normal development that is usually characteristic of a great literary genius. The exposition in the *Supplices* and in the *Persae* is less skilful in point of form and substance than in the later plays. In these the necessary elucidation of the past is combined with natural and suitable dramatic action.

It is difficult for us to realize how baffling the problem of successful exposition must have seemed at a time when the drama was still in its embryonic phase. Centuries afterward, even Ibsen, who is generally and not unjustly regarded as a past master in the art of dramatic construction, occasionally found it no easy task to unfold the past with originality and ease. The method to which he resorted at the beginning of *Hedda Gabler* is certainly trite. The dialogue between Miss Tesman and the servant Berta is rather frankly explanatory of the situation than dramatically necessary, and similar dialogues with servants have been part of the stock-in-trade of all dramatists from time immemorial. Even the device of the sewing-bee in *Pillars of Society* is really not much more commendable. Euripides is perhaps

---

[1] In the *Ranae* of Aristophanes, verse 1122, Euripides implies that the Aeschylean prologue was obscure: ἀσαφὴς γὰρ ἦν ἐν τῇ φράσει τῶν πραγμάτων. Meineke (*Aristophanis Comoediae*, Leipzig, 1860) rejects the line. Most commentors refer it to the purely verbal criticisms that follow. In any case, it need not be taken too seriously.

rightly censured for introducing as a speaker of the prologue a character who takes no part in the action of the play after his disappearance at the end of the monologue.   But in *Pillars of Society*, for
obvious purposes of exposition, several characters appear who, although they are much more lifelike than the formal figures often used
by Euripides, are not intimately concerned with the main characters
or plot of the play.   In general, the methods of exposition employed
by both Aeschylus and Sophocles do not compare unfavorably with
those of the best modern playwrights.

2. *The Repetition of Expository Details after the Parodos or Prologue.*

It is astonishing to discover how often in the course of a play the
ancient dramatists repeated facts already clearly explained in the
parodos or prologue.   The recapitulation is most noticeable in the
plays of Euripides.   In the *Electra*, for example, although the poet
modified the conventional characters and, to a certain extent, the
conventional plot by many innovations of his own, yet he repeatedly
put so much stress upon events which occurred before the beginning
of the play, that, without assuming for the audience more than a very
general knowledge of the myth, the action would be absolutely clear
if the prologue were omitted, and the play began with line 167.   In
the *Helen* and in the *Medea*, also, the repetition of information provided in the prologue is so constant as to render the opening scene,
from the point of view of clarity, unnecessary.   In fact, in only two
of Euripides's plays are the explanations supplied in the prologue indispensable in order that the dramatic action which follows may be
intelligible.   In the *Ion*, unless the spectators had heard the first part
of the prologue (1–81), they would have been at a loss to understand
all that ensues up to line 859 ff., where Creusa discloses her past. They
would also have failed to comprehend the intense dramatic irony of
many intervening passages.[1]   The prologue of the *Bacchae* is necessary

---

[1] Cf. 329 ff.   The field of Latin comedy lies outside the scope of this paper, but
the *Captivi* of Plautus provides a parallel illustration.   In this comedy, indeed,
there is sufficient recapitulation to render the prologue unnecessary for expository
purposes.   Cf. 92–101 with 24–34, and 224 and 241 with 37–39.   But without the
prologue, the spectators would have been kept rather too long in the dark with

in order that the identity of Dionysus, when he appears before Pentheus, may be clear.

The phenomenon is not lacking in the dramas of Sophocles, although he, to a lesser degree than Euripides, had recourse to repetitions. In the *Antigone*, there is sufficient recapitulation to make it possible to dispense with the prologue as far as purposes of exposition are concerned. In that case, the explication of the past would, indeed, be less immediate, but, owing to the gradual method of exposition which was characteristic of Sophocles as well as of Aeschylus, entirely lucid. The prologue of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the *Electra*, and the *Trachiniae* can be similarly detached from the rest of the play. But the prologue is indispensable in the *Ajax*, the *Oedipus Coloneus*, and the *Philoctetes*. In the *Ajax*, the prologue is demanded in order that it may be understood that Ajax killed the cattle of the Greeks under the delusion that he was slaying the Atridae (56–57), an important point not repeated later in the play. The reason for the appearance of the chorus in the *Oedipus Coloneus* would not be clear without the prologue (77–80), and the detailed account of the oracle (84 ff.) which spoke of the seat of the σεμναὶ θεαί as the final resting place for Oedipus, and of thunder as the sign of the approaching end, is necessary if the conclusion of the drama is to be intelligible. In the *Philoctetes*, it must be made plain that the story of Neoptolemus's wrath at the award of the armor of Achilles to Odysseus is a fiction, as revealed in the prologue (54 ff.).

The plays of Aeschylus present similar repetitions. Indeed, the reiteration of the expository details of the parodos or prologue is so constant in all his extant tragedies that each, irrespective of the parodos or prologue, provides sufficient repeated information to make the development of the action absolutely plain. Let us imagine that we did not possess the parodos of the *Supplices*, and that the play opened with line 40. In the course of lines 40–48 we should learn that the suppliant maidens are descendants of Epaphus (a repetition of the information of 15–18); lines 70–72 would reveal their Egyptian origin (cf. 1–4); at lines 76 ff. we should perceive that they are suppliants (cf. 1; 21–22), and a little later (117), that they have come to the

regard to the real identity of Tyndarus, a point made clear by line 4, and not explained again until 990. They would also have failed to comprehend the comic irony, so to speak, of a line like 304.

Peloponnesus (cf. 15) in flight from a marriage (141–143) that is distasteful to them (cf. 9–10). Finally, in their conversation with Pelasgus (234 ff.), comes as complete a revelation of the past as there is to be found anywhere in the play, — a detailed repetition of all the explanations of the parodos. If, then, the *Supplices* began with verse 40, the elucidation of the past would be more gradual than it is in the play as we have it, but equally clear. In fact, the play could intelligibly open at verse 176 where Danaus speaks for the first time, or even at verse 234 where Pelasgus appears upon the scene, in which case the exposition would be as immediate as it is in the parodos. In the same way, the parodos or prologue of his other tragedies could be disregarded without rendering the rest of the play unintelligible. In the *Persae*, the first choral ode supplies sufficient explanations to make the parodos unnecessary for purposes of exposition (cf. 65–72; 140–149; 170–171). The prologue of the *Septem* is similarly superfluous because of recapitulation later (cf. lines 59–60; 6 and 39; 42–48 and 70–72 of the prologue with lines 120–121; 203; 283–287; 655). In the *Prometheus*, lines 199–243 and 254 repeat the information of 1–11. Lines 40 ff. and 264–316 of the *Agamemnon* render the play intelligible without the prologue. In the *Choephoroe*, lines 135–136, 225 ff, and 269–273 rehearse the explanations of the prologue. Lines 282 ff. and 202 of the *Eumenides* make it possible to dispense with the prologue (cf. 40–45 and 84).

How are we to explain this frequent repetition in Greek tragedy? The causes are not far to seek. In plays·that begin with an entering chorus, the antecedent events which it was desirable for the spectators immediately to know are disclosed in the anapaests of the parodos. But since the first song of the chorus regularly follows directly after this exposition, before the action of the drama has really begun, it is obviously unavoidable that there should be repeated references to the past. Otherwise, the chorus would have to fly off at a tangent, and descant upon a subject having no immediate relation to the dramatic situation. The *Supplices* and the *Persae* are illustrative of these conclusions. Moreover, after the completion of the choral ode and the appearance of an actor upon the scene, since as yet there has been no real action in the drama, allusion must once more be made to antecedent events until the action proper begins to develop. This is

the explanation of the references in the *Persae* to the events of the past in the conversation of the chorus with Atossa (155 ff.). Repetition seems occasionally demanded also in order that various *dramatis personae* may be enlightened in regard to details which have already been explained to the audience earlier in the play. In the *Supplices*, the Danaids must needs once more rehearse (234 ff.), for the benefit of Pelasgus, the tale of their sad plight. Conversely, after the introduction and acceptance of the prologue as the proper preliminary scene for a Greek drama, the speaker of the prologue, having explained the situation to the audience, often found it necessary to acquaint the chorus, after its entrance, with the same facts. To cite an instance from the *Agamemnon*, the spectators heard from the watchman's lips in the prologue the news of the fall of Troy, but the chorus learned later from Clytaemnestra of the arrival of the beacon-fire. In the *Prometheus*, too, Prometheus repeats many details concerning the past for the sake of the daughters of Oceanus. The *Trachiniae* of Sophocles, and the *Helen*, the *Heraclidae*, and the *Troiades* of Euripides have analogous repetitions. When the first part of the prologue is a monologue, it is sometimes necessary to recapitulate the information contained therein for the benefit of both chorus and characters. In the prologue of the *Hippolytus*, Aphrodite states that it is she who is to bring destruction upon Hippolytus, an important fact that is explained at 1327 to Theseus and the chorus, and at 1400 to Hippolytus. Occasionally, the chorus is cognizant of part of the past as set forth in the prologue, but must be enlightened about some details. In the *Hecuba*, the chorus themselves repeat many facts of the prologue, but they must be informed at 710 ff. of the significance of Polydorus's death which was explained in the prologue. Sometimes the facts of the opening monologue are reiterated for characters who appear later. In the *Supplices* of Euripides, the chorus is present during the monologue of Aethra, but repetition is resorted to for the benefit of Theseus. There are similar repetitions in the *Iphigenia Taurica*, the *Orestes*, and the *Bacchae*.

These practical reasons for frequent recapitulation in Greek tragedy are, of course, not exhaustive. There are other explanations which might be given in the case of individual plays. When the Theban maidens who form the chorus of the *Septem* first appear upon the scene,

they are sufficiently cognizant of the situation already explained to
the audience in the prologue. Here the repeated emphasis they give
to the danger that threatens Thebes serves to enhance the general
impression of terror which Aeschylus apparently wished to secure in
this scene. The *Choephoroe* affords an analogous illustration. Neither
Electra nor the chorus is ignorant of the facts referred to in the pro-
logue by Orestes, yet for dramatic reasons there is frequent reiteration
of many details throughout the play. The sympathy of the spectators
for Electra and Orestes would be the keener, if the poet constantly
recalled to their minds the fact that the son, who was absent from
home when his father was slain, has returned to wreak vengeance on
the murderers. There is slight repetition of facts relating to the past
in the *Eumenides*. The chorus know all that has occurred before the
action of the play begins. One important point revealed in the pro-
logue (84), namely, Apollo's statement that he directed Orestes to
slay his mother, is constantly rehearsed throughout the play. It
serves to alleviate the guilt of Orestes. In the *Alcestis* of Euripides,
the repeated emphasis put upon the voluntary sacrifice of Alcestis
enhances her unselfishness. In the *Heracles*, the repetition of the in-
formation revealed in the monologue of Amphitryon seems somewhat
banal. Both the chorus and Lycus know the facts. But the taunt-
ing way in which Lycus refers to the past achievements of Heracles
perhaps justifies the repeated allusion to some of these accomplish-
ments. There are two reasons for recapitulation in the plays of Euri-
pides which would not apply in the case of Aeschylus or Sophocles. In
the first place, Euripides apparently often resorted to repetitions for the
sake of dwelling, with perhaps a certain degree of pride, upon his own
modifications of stereotyped details of the myths. Since, however,
the prologue of all but two plays may be detached from the rest of the
drama without endangering the clarity of ensuing events, Euripides
did not adopt a formal prologue in order that he might make plain
the radical changes that he introduced into some of the old legends.
In the second place, although I do not know why Euripides chose an
undramatic introduction for his plays, I am convinced that he was as
fully conscious of the purely formal character of most of his prologues
as his modern critics. It is true that it is possible to dispense with the
parodos or prologue in all the extant tragedies of Aeschylus, and with

the prologue in four plays of Sophocles, yet, with these two poets, the opening scene seems an organic part of the action of the drama. It would be absurd to argue that they deliberately endeavored to make their tragedies intelligible without the parodos or prologue. But to consider an Euripidean prologue, in general, an essential part of the rest of the play, is an injustice to the poet.

Clayton Hamilton, who believes that scenes of violence were impossible on the Greek stage because the actors were encumbered with the *cothurnus*,[1] and who adopts a similarly mechanical explanation of the " falling action " in Greek tragedy,[2] would probably prefer to attribute the repetition in Greek drama to poor acoustic arrangements. Such an explanation, however, would be ridiculous in the light of a play like the *Ranae* of Aristophanes, every word of which is so exquisitely chosen. If the Greeks had not remembered with astonishing accuracy innumerable lines from tragedies, the parodies of comic poets would have had for them no point. Owing to lack of statistics regarding the relative proportion of men and women in an ancient Greek audience, it is, unfortunately, impossible to apply to Greek tragedy Clayton Hamilton's ingenious explanation of the same phenomenon of repetition in modern drama.[3] Commenting on the comparatively negligible number of men who are theatre-goers, he observes: " Furthermore, since women are by nature comparatively inattentive, the femininity of the modern theatre audience forces the dramatist to employ the elementary technical tricks of repetition and parallelism in order to keep his play clear, though much of it be unattended to."

Now neither Aeschylus nor Sophocles revealed all the important facts of the past in the parodos or prologue, but adopted the distributive method of exposition in all their plays. Consequently, those antecedent events that they disclosed after the opening scene, they often repeated in the course of the drama, in the same manner in which we have just seen that they recapitulated the information set forth in the parodos or prologue itself. In short, there is a dual repetition of explanatory details in Greek tragedy. Naturally, it was

[1] *The Theory of The Theatre*, New York, 1910, p. 26. But cf. K. K. Smith, *The Use of the High-Soled Shoe or Buskin in Greek Tragedy of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries*, B.C., Harvard Studies in Class. Phil., Vol. XVI, 1905, pp. 123–164.

[2] Cf. *The Bookman*, October, 1915, *The Troublesome Last Act*, pp. 154–155.

[3] *The Theory of the Theatre*, p. 53.

desirable that this constant reversion to facts already proclaimed should be as little trite as possible, a difficult task which the Greek poets accomplished by adopting the same device that Browning used in *The Ring and the Book*. Their audience heard the reiterated rehearsal of antecedent circumstances from the lips of characters of very unlike temperaments who reflect upon the past from absolutely different points of view. In this way, the Greek dramatists imparted to the repetition a subtle psychological interest. Why did they not avoid the repetition altogether? I have pointed out some of the reasons for the recapitulation of the facts of parodos or prologue, many of which apply to the repetition of additional information given to the audience after the opening scene. But a general explanation may be found in the peculiar structure of Greek tragedy. In ancient times, a tragedy represented merely a catastrophe or the result of a catastrophe occurring before the drama begins.[1] In the former instance, the subject-matter must deal largely with the past, since the dramatic action of the present can be of scarcely more than momentary importance. Hence, considerable time is consumed in informing the spectators of the way in which various *dramatis personae* are affected by the recollection of the past. Their reflections both precede and follow the catastrophe. But in dramas that are concerned only with the results of a great calamity, the plot must deal exclusively with the past. The entire tragedy can scarcely be anything more than a collection of diverse opinions in regard to antecedent events.

To illustrate this point with special reference to the plays of Aeschylus, the *Supplices* cannot be said to have a real catastrophe of its own. It rather exhibits the consequences of a calamity which is ἔξω τοῦ δράματος; hence the frequent recurrence in this play to the events of the past. These are successively rehearsed in greater or less detail by the Danaids for the benefit of the audience (1–39), again, by the suppliant maidens to Pelasgus (234–347), and finally the attitude of the herald of Aegyptus' sons is revealed (916–937). The plot of the *Persae* is wholly concerned with the past; for the defeat of the Persian host has already taken place when the play begins, yet the narration of the details of the battle by the messenger endows the play for all practical purposes with a catastrophe of its own. Hence, when the

---

[1] Cf. above, pp. 165 ff.

drama opens, the poet describes the vague anxiety of the elders (8–15) and the more definite fears of Atossa (159 ff.) in regard to the expedition which has gone to Greece. After the announcement of the disaster, the emotions of the messenger, the chorus, and Atossa are depicted (249 ff.). The account of the defeat is repeated in the conversation of Atossa with Darius, and the attitude of the latter toward the calamity is made clear (709 ff.), with new references to its historical significance. At length its effect upon Xerxes is revealed (909 ff.). It must be admitted, however, that on account of the faint differentiation of character in both the *Supplices* and the *Persae,* and the rather monotonous atmosphere of woe that pervades each play, the method is less skilfully used than in the later tragedies.

The *Septem* has a tremendous catastrophe of its own which, nevertheless, is so largely the result of antecedent events that many allusions to the past in this play are unavoidable. But the repetition is less apparent than in the *Supplices* and the *Persae* because the characters are more strongly contrasted, as, for example, early in the play where the terror of the maidens in the face of an impending attack of an enemy (78–180) is a fitting foil to the bravery and self-forgetful patriotism of Eteocles (1–77). The poet took special pains to interest his audience in the attitude of various characters toward the curse of Oedipus, as revealed both before and after the death of the brothers.[1] It was necessary for him to make constant reference to the curse because it is the cause of the catastrophe.

The *Prometheus* is an extraordinarily good illustration of the fact that a Greek tragedy, although it may have a catastrophe of its own, is largely dependent upon the past for its subject-matter. Here the dénouement does not occur until the end of the play, and there is scarcely any development of the dramatic action of the present. What Francisque Sarcey would call *scènes à faire* are absent to an astonishing degree; indeed, the entire play is nothing but an unfolding of conditions already existent. A more static drama is almost unimaginable. In this respect, the *Prometheus* is more analogous to Ibsen's *Ghosts* than is the *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles to which Ibsen's

---

[1] Eteocles: 70 ff., 655; 695–697; the chorus: 720–791; 832–834; 895–899; 907–910; 940–944; Antigone and Ismene: 875–878; 881–887; the messenger: 814–820.

play is often compared. In the Sophoclean tragedy, after the com-
plete revelation of the past, there is still time for the blinding of
Oedipus, the suicide of Iocasta, and the final arrangements concerning
the departure of Oedipus for Thebes. But in Ibsen's play, and in the
Prometheus, the drama of the present is of purely momentary impor-
tance at the end of the tragedy. It is the drama of the past that
occupies our attention. Yet in the *Prometheus*, in spite of the fre-
quent references to the past, the characters of the drama have tem-
peraments so dissimilar that the repetition is not wearisome. For the
remarks of Kratos and Bia, Hephaestus, the Oceanids, Oceanus,
Hermes, and Prometheus himself, apropos of the guilt of the suffering
god, reveal an exquisite variety of opinions.

It is in the *Agamemnon*, however, where at every point the ver-
satile dramatic genius of Aeschylus is most conspicuous, that the
subtlety and delicacy of Browning in characterization are antici-
pated. Both before and after the catastrophe, the recapitulation
of the past is exceedingly skilful. Detailed analysis would be
wearisome here, but two instances of effective repetition deserve
comment. First the watchman, and then Clytaemnestra, announce
the fall of Troy to the spectators and to the chorus respectively. The
repetition is, nevertheless, scarcely noticeable, because of the different
ways in which Agamemnon's loyal servant and his faithless wife are
affected by the beacon-fire. The joy of the former is simple and
sincere, the spontaneous outburst of a humble man rejoicing in the
thought that he may soon clasp his master's hand in affectionate
greeting; but Clytaemnestra's happiness is simulated, except in so
far as she inwardly exults at the thought of her eagerly anticipated
revenge. It is also interesting to compare the passage (320 ff.) where
Clytaemnestra in imagination visualizes the sights in the captured
city with the messenger's account (503–537) of the state of affairs
that prevailed there when he left. For if we recall lines 341–342:

> ἔρως δὲ μή τις πρότερον ἐμπίπτῃ στρατῷ
> πορθεῖν ἃ μὴ χρή, κέρδεσιν νικωμένους,

where Clytaemnestra apparently voices as a fear what was in reality
her highest hope, namely, that Agamemnon might sin against the
gods so that his death at her hand might seem a fitting retribution,

we appreciate the admirable dramatic irony of the messenger's naïve boast in regard to the sacrilegious destruction of the altars and temples of the gods at Troy (527):

βωμοὶ δ'ἄιστοι καὶ θεῶν ἱδρύματα.

Wilamowitz, whose comments are generally more illuminating, has failed absolutely to appreciate the dramatic value of Clytaemnestra's speech beginning at line 320. He alludes to the " naïve Dramaturgie " of the passage, and asks how Clytaemnestra, " die Frau, die zu Hause sass," knows what she relates.[1] Naturally, she does not know, and she does not need to know. Much of the power of the passage is due to the fact that it is the creation of Clytaemnestra's vivid imagination, marvelously quickened by the longed-for news that Troy has fallen. Her entire speech is a splendid example of Aeschylus's skill in accomplishing many ends simultaneously. It serves the practical purpose of revealing the past in its suggestions of the scenes in the captured city; it prepares the way for the fall of Agamemnon through its hint of sacrilege; and it reveals Clytaemnestra as a woman of compelling personal force. She pays not the slightest attention to the request of the chorus (318–319) that she repeat to them the story of the beacon-fire; yet, at 351 ff., the elders, forsooth, "having heard her sure proofs" are convinced. Aeschylus was a master of dramatic construction.

There is a similar diversity of opinion in the *Choephoroe* in regard to the past, particularly in the various attitudes of different characters toward the death of Agamemnon. The speech of the nurse (734 ff.) gives the humorous relief desirable after the intensely solemn words of Electra and Orestes. Aegisthus is touched already by the consciousness of sin (841–843), but Clytaemnestra is remorseless even in the face of death. Finally Orestes, after the completion of his task, interprets the past from his point of view. In the *Eumenides*, which represents simply the result of the catastrophes of the two preceding plays, the detailed repetition of the facts relating to the crime of Orestes is alleviated by the interesting controversy between the Erinyes and Apollo, who have very different comments to make on the events of the past.

[1] *Aischylos Interpretationen*, pp. 167–168.

In the plays of Euripides, also, which are often controversial in character, the polemical discussions of his *dramatis personae* help to conceal many repetitions. At the beginning of the *Alcestis*, Apollo (1–27), Thanatos (28–76), the chorus (77–135), the maidservant (141 ff.), and others give vent to their opinions in regard to the swiftly approaching death of Alcestis. After Alcestis, as it seems, has died, Pheres and Admetus (614–670) indulge in altercation over the past. The method is very noticeable in the *Electra*.

Sophocles, too, was similarly skilful in giving the charm of variety to passages of recapitulation. The *Ajax* affords an excellent illustration, where in the passages leading up to the catastrophe, the poet revealed the various feelings of Odysseus (14–35), Athena (36–90), the insane Ajax (91–117), the chorus (134–200), Tecmessa (201–347), and the sane Ajax (348–595) in regard to the slaughter of the cattle of the Greeks. The variety of temperament and convictions here displayed is truly kaleidoscopic. After Ajax has finally put an end to his life, Menelaus, in order to show good and sufficient cause why Ajax does not merit burial, again reverts to his crime (1052–1090). In the *Trachiniae*, Lichas's reluctant confirmation (472 ff.) of the messenger's report to Deianira (351 ff.) that Heracles conquered Eurytus and Oechalia for Iole's sake, is another instance of effective repetition.

3. *The Gradual Exposition of the Past*

The modern dramatist, as I have said, frequently devotes several scenes at the beginning of a play, or even an entire first act, to explanations intended to acquaint the audience with the situation. Neither Aeschylus nor Sophocles, however, so concentrated his attention to exposition upon the opening scenes. Aeschylus, more conspicuously than Sophocles, by adopting the gradual method of disclosing antecedent conditions, contrived to elucidate the past in a manner that is interesting as well as dramatically effective. His skill in this respect is one of the most convincing proofs of his dexterity in dramatic construction.

In the *Supplices*, the poet used this mode of exposition less successfully than in other plays, — an evidence of the early date of this drama, and of Aeschylus's improved technique in his later tragedies. It is almost impossible to avoid the conviction that the poet in this play,

having given his audience the key to the dramatic situation in the frank and unstudied revelations of the parodos, felt with a sigh of relief that the troublesome task of exposition was over, and that he could now safely approach the situation from the lyric side. Certain points that are obscure in the parodos remain obscure throughout the play, for instance, the events immediately preceding the flight of the Danaids from Egypt. Furthermore, few facts relating to the past, of importance for an understanding of the plot or characters of the drama, are revealed after the parodos. After lines 11–33 no further light is thrown upon the personality of Danaus;[1] the sons of Aegyptus throughout the play remain the violent suitors described in the opening scene. Yet even in the *Supplices*, Aeschylus at least experimented with the gradual unfolding of the past, and not altogether ineffectively. For the first time at lines 160–161 the Danaids announce that they will hang themselves if they cannot escape the marriage that they loathe, — a plan which we may suppose is not suddenly conceived, but has been in their minds since their departure from Egypt. The audience, it is interesting to note, was let into the secret fairly early in the play, but the announcement to Pelasgus of the maidens' intention was wisely deferred until lines 455 ff., when it turns the scales of Fortune at a moment of great dramatic tension in their favor. Again, in the long harangue of Pelasgus about himself (249–273), nothing was said of the fact that his power is limited, but the revelation of this rather important item was reserved for the moment (368–369) when the king proclaims that he must consult this assembly in regard to the fate of the suppliants. By this device Aeschylus prolonged the action of the drama, and secured the ever-desirable suspense. The gradual revelation of facts pertaining to the experiences of Io is most conspicuous. This is to be ascribed to the practical necessity of finding material for the numerous choral passages in a play so largely lyrical rather than to the desire of the poet to keep his audience in suspense. But he attained a slight dramatic tension in the passage (291 ff.) where he used the facts of this myth to work up to proof of the Argive descent of the Danaids.

In the *Persae*, the poet seems to have arrived at a fuller consciousness of the dramatic value of distributive exposition. He was careful

[1] Cf. 176–177; 991–992.

not to follow the example of Phrynichus and announce the defeat of
Xerxes at the beginning of the tragedy. He deliberately delayed the
news in order that it might be revealed at the most effective moment.
The audience, however, was prepared for the arrival of the messenger
with his lugubrious tidings, not only by the pessimistic tone of the
prologue, but by other more definite statements. Such are the sug-
gestions or the frank avowal that the Persians have been guilty of
ὕβρις,[1] and the implication that the gods themselves have doomed
Persia to destruction.[2] The terrifying dream of Atossa and the
gloomy omen of the eagle and the hawk are unmistakably prophetic
of disaster. But the mention of the oracles predicting the defeat was
fittingly held in reserve until after the appearance of the messenger.
Previous to this point, any reference to these oracles would have been
disastrous to the peculiar aspect of terror created by the vague anxiety
of the chorus and Atossa.

Of many illustrations of this method that might be cited from the
Septem, the most interesting for this essay is the frequent reference
to the curse of Oedipus, because it bears upon the interrelation of
the plays of the trilogy. From many passages in the *Septem*, but
especially from lines 720–791, which summarize the plots of the two
preceding plays, it seems probable that the curse of Oedipus against
his sons was uttered in the second play of the trilogy. But in spite of
this, in the *Septem*, Aeschylus adopted the gradual method of expo-
sition in his allusions to it. Similarly, in the *Choephoroe* and in the
Eumenides, he elucidated only by degrees the details of Agamemnon's
death, although this had formed the plot of the first play of the trilogy.
The poet, accordingly, for dramatic reasons did not hesitate in one
play to resort to a gradual unfolding of facts which had already been
clearly set forth in a preceding play, in precisely the same way in
which he used the method in all his tragedies for the revelation of new
information concerning the past. That he did this for dramatic
reasons in the *Septem* is perfectly plain. Eteocles refers to the curse
early in the drama (69–72) when he beseeches the gods not to over-
throw utterly the city, and again (653–655), when he learns that
Polynices is stationed at the seventh gate. But it is not until the
chorus entreat Eteocles not to go out to meet his brother in battle

----

[1] Cf. 65–72; 108–119.   [2] Cf. 93–114.

that the spectators learned that Eteocles now understands that the fulfilment of the curse means death for him (695–697):

> φίλου γὰρ ἐχθρά μοι πατρὸς μέλαιν' ἀρὰ
> ξηροῖς· ἀκλαύτοις ὄμμασιν προσιζάνει,
> λέγουσα κέρδος πρότερον ὑστέρου μόρου.[1]

The revelation at this crisis, and not before, is admirable, because it throws into high relief the grim patriotism of Thebes's defender, as he goes forth to meet his brother in the spirit of Macbeth when he hears that the witches' prophecies have played him false:

> Yet will I try the last. Before my body
> I throw my warlike shield; lay on, Macduff,
> And damn'd be him that first cries, " Hold, enough ! "

It is also indicative of Aeschylus's interest in the details of dramatic composition that the references to the curse become more specific as the play advances. Not until the pause in the action that ensues after the departure of Eteocles did the poet mention the cause of the curse and speak openly of its nature (785–791). Such plain speaking earlier in the play would not have been desirable. The disclosure at this time is a fitting prelude to the appearance of the messenger with his sad tidings.

In the *Prometheus*, Aeschylus observed the principle of suspense by disclosing gradually the nature of the secret with which Prometheus threatens Zeus. To this Prometheus merely alludes in his conversation with the Oceanids;[2] details he explains at length to Io,[3] who is naturally interested in anything that concerns Zeus. After the departure of Io, the additional remarks of Prometheus about the fatal marriage of Zeus[4] pave the way for the appearance of Hermes. The complete disclosure of the facts relating to the benefits which Prometheus has conferred upon mankind, referred to very early in the play,[5] is appropriately made in the course of the conversation of Prometheus with the Oceanids (230–243; 436–506), where it is most

---

[1] Cf. 703: Ετ. τί οὖν ἔτ' ἂν σαίνομεν ὀλέθριον μόρον; also, 1014: Κη. στέγων γὰρ ἐχθροὺς θάνατον εἵλετ' ἐν πόλει.

[2] Cf. 168–172; 188–194; 519–525.

[3] Cf. 755–770.   [4] Cf. 907–910.

[5] Cf. 7–8; 29–30; 37–38; 82–83; 107–111.

likely to arouse sympathy for the suffering god. With the same extraordinary sense of the dramatic fitness of things, the poet held in reserve the disclosure of the fact that Oceanus had been an ally of Prometheus until the moment when the purely conventional sympathy of the former is in strongest contrast to his previous conduct. Lines 332–333,

> Πρ. ζηλῶ σ' ὁθούνεκ' ἐκτὸς αἰτίας κυρεῖς,
> πάντων μετασχὼν καὶ τετολμηκὼς ἐμοί,

are not necessarily contradictory of the thought of line 236,

> Πρ. καὶ τοισίδ' οὐδεὶς ἀντέβαινε πλὴν ἐμοῦ,

which may be interpreted to mean that Prometheus took the initiative in opposition to the plan of Zeus to destroy the human race. The imperfect tense ἀντέβαινε is suggestive of this. Paley's[1] translation based on the scholia, distorts the Greek. To give a final illustration from the *Prometheus*, there is no mention of the curse of Kronos against Zeus until the attitude of Prometheus toward Zeus becomes most menacing (910–912). At this juncture, the allusion to the curse adds weight to the threats of the angry god.

I have already[2] touched upon the question of the comparative advantages and disadvantages of dramatic composition in ancient and in modern times. As regards the gradual method of exposition, however, the ancient dramatist had an indisputable advantage over the modern playwright who would resort to the same device. Owing to the familiarity of his audience with the myths to which he gave a dramatic form, the ancient poet could safely reserve for the most fitting occasion definite mention of a fact to which a modern dramatist would be forced to make an earlier allusion for the sake of clarity. The advantage of the Greek dramatist in this respect was really twofold. In the first place, he could more easily maintain an atmosphere of suspense. In the second place, he could make far more frequent and effective use of dramatic irony. A situation or a sentence might be intensely ironical to an audience familiar with the myth, whereas a modern playwright would have to be much more direct, and consequently, less stimulating in his suggestions.

---

[1] *The Tragedies of Aeschylus*, London, 1879, p. 119, note on v. 338.
[2] Cf. above, pp. 167 ff.

Nowhere is this truth more convincingly illustrated than in the *Agamemnon*, especially in the speech of the watchman which constitutes the prologue. Here the poet without danger of obscurity could use ambiguous phrases like those of lines 10–11:

ὧδε γὰρ κρατεῖ
γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλον ἐλπίζον κέαρ.

He could make ironical allusion to the wantonness of Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus (18–19):

κλαίω τότ' οἴκου τοῦδε συμφορὰν στένων
οὐχ ὡς τὰ πρόσθ' ἄριστα διαπονουμένου.

He could represent the watchman as absolutely loyal to those he serves, and yet show unmistakably that the sin of Clytaemnestra is an open secret (38–39):

ὡς ἑκὼν ἐγὼ
μαθοῦσιν αὐδῶ κοὐ μαθοῦσι λήθομαι.

A soliloquy so subtly suggestive at the beginning of a modern play would be unimaginable. To Aeschylus's audience it can have been nothing short of thrilling, and in its appeal to their imaginations must have more than compensated for any triteness in the myth itself. The *Agamemnon*, too, more than any other extant play of Aeschylus, reveals the advantages of the distributive mode of explication for purposes of suspense and climax. The tragedy contains a host of references to the sacrifice of Iphigenia,[1] some of them purposely ambiguous, others more direct. All of them, however, seem to lead up to the climax at 1412 ff., where Clytaemnestra for the first time states that her motive in slaying Agamemnon was to avenge the death of her daughter. It was a stroke of true dramatic genius to defer the announcement of Clytaemnestra's motive until this moment. She is here absolutely truthful; up to this point she has lied " like truth." It is, therefore, the proper psychological time for the disclosure of the principal reason that goaded her to murder. Besides, her silence on the subject of Iphigenia during her interview with Agamemnon earlier in the play (855 ff.) is indicative of her self-

---

[1] Cf. 69–71; 131–133; 141; 151; 155; 204–247; 346; 369–372; 763 ff.; 904–905; 1019–1021; 1338–1342.

possession and of the depth of her passionate desire for revenge.   For the restraint of Clytaemnestra is the restraint of controlled feeling, not the restraint of coldness.   Otherwise, she could not speak of Iphigenia so tenderly (1417–1418) as

$$\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu\ \dot{\epsilon}\mu o\grave{\iota}$$
$$\dot{\omega}\delta\hat{\iota}\nu',$$

and again (1526) as

$$\tau\grave{\eta}\nu\ \pi o\lambda\upsilon\kappa\lambda\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\eta\nu\ \mathring{I}\phi\iota\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu.$$

With his usual skilful technique, Aeschylus thus adapted the gradual method of exposition here to purposes of characterization as well as to purposes of suspense.   The dramatic feeling of a modern poet [1] who represents Clytaemnestra as speaking plaintively of Iphigenia, when she greets her husband on his return from Troy, is less praise-worthy:

> Welcome, my king, and welcome, husband, home !
> The old house of your fathers laughs once more,
> That was so long a place of woman's tears;
> And the old faithful love spreads out its arms,
> To take you to your ancient place again.
> Not, stitch by stitch, a woman's tale I'll tell,
> Here, in this laurelled hour, of all my fears,
> Of lying tales that come on travelling lips,
> And omens of the night, and whispered things
> Of seas and wind, that moaned about the house,
> Nor of a mother's aching heart will speak.
> That scans your sunlit laurels all in vain
> For the white flower of Iphigenia's face.

A similarly effective use of deliberately retarded explanations appears in the references to the feast of Thyestes [2] that form the prelude to the speech of Aegisthus (1577 ff.) in which he states that, although not a resident of the palace, he planned the entire murder (1608–1609) to avenge the deeds of Atreus, Agamemnon's father, against his own brother Thyestes, the father of Aegisthus.   Here the method makes for suspense, and produces an excellent climax.   There is no reason to suspect that Aegisthus is not speaking the truth in taking to himself the credit for the plot against Agamemnon.   Cassandra herself uses

[1] Richard Le Gallienne, *Orestes*, New York, 1910, p. 9.
[2] Cf. 701–705; 1095–1097; 1217–1226; 1242–1244; 1500–1504.

the word βουλεύειν of Aegisthus (1223), and states the motive for his crime (1217 ff.). Another purpose in the mind of the poet, when he held in reserve for so long the disclosure of Aegisthus's part in the death of Agamemnon, was this, that, having shown through Clytaemnestra's deed of vengeance one motive for the murder, he might at the end of the play round out the picture by revealing the larger significance of the crime as but one incident in a sad succession of disasters.

I have already[1] referred to the distributive exposition of the *Choephoroe* and the *Eumenides*, and to dwell upon it at greater length is unnecessary. What distinguishes the *Choephoroe* from the other plays of Aeschylus is that the poet in this tragedy was exceedingly chary of this method. The entire drama is characterized by a striking direct-ness. Simultaneously with the first mention of the oracle of Apollo (269 ff.) comes a complete elucidation of the god's directions, with no attempt to retard any explanations. In lines 269 ff. Orestes reiterates the divine ordinance, and adds thereto all the other motives for the murder, — sorrow for his father, the pinch of poverty, and the patri-otic desire to rescue his countrymen from tyranny. The explanation is to be found in the poet's conception of the temperament of Orestes. The latter has none of the self-reliance of Clytaemnestra. The deed that he must do is an ever-present horror to him. In order that the audience might understand this, it was necessary for the poet to show them that Orestes, having once steeled himself to act, does not dare to hesitate, but must keep all his motives clearly in mind, and con-summate the crime with all speed. The *Choephoroe* is not unlike a modern drama in which we generally see the workings of the motives that induce the catastrophe, — a psychological process not usually revealed in a Greek tragedy, or explained only after the catastrophe.

Sophocles, too, realized the dramatic value of the gradual unfolding of conditions already existent when the play begins. The powerful irony of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* is intensified by the gradual explication of the past. But with the exception of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, in Sophocles's plays, the subordination of the principle of suspense to his supreme interest in characterization is apparent. At the beginning of the *Antigone* (35–36), it is announced that whosoever disobeys the king must die a death by public stoning. Now a poet whose energies

---

[1] Cf. above, pp. 144 ff.

were primarily directed toward effective dramatic construction would
have reserved the announcement of the specific penalty of disobedience
for line 460, that the audience for a time might be kept in ignorance.
Sophocles, however, preferred to reveal the loving, yet courageous
and determined spirit of Antigone, when she first appears upon the
scene. The postponement of any mention of Haemon until verse 568
seems upon first consideration to be quite in the Aeschylean manner,
but the tension created by the uncertainty as to whether Creon will
be moved or not by this final appeal of Ismene on behalf of her sister
is but momentary. The attention of the audience must have been
immediately concentrated upon Antigone's unselfish reference to her
lover (572):

$$\tilde{\omega} \; \phi \acute{\iota} \lambda \tau a \theta' \; A \hat{\iota} \mu o \nu, \; \H{\omega} s \; \sigma' \; \grave{a} \tau \iota \mu \acute{a} \zeta \epsilon \iota \; \pi a \tau \acute{\eta} \rho.$$

In the *Oedipus Coloneus*, Oedipus does not refer in detail to his un-
happy past until lines 510 ff., but Sophocles made no careful prepara-
tion for this exposition, nor is it in the least productive of suspense.
Here Sophocles was chiefly interested in the vindication of Oedipus's
moral innocence. Similarly, in the *Electra*, the heroine does not tell
Chrysothemis that her plan to slay Aegisthus was conceived of old
until line 1049, but her remark creates no climax like Clytaemnestra's
impassioned defence of her deed over her dead husband's body as
she speaks of her long-contemplated revenge (*Ag.* 1376–1378). Elec-
tra's observation serves rather to bring out her own deeply thoughtful
and deliberate temperament. It is also interesting to compare the
immediate revelation of the details of Clytaemnestra's dream in this
play (410 ff.) with the studied distribution of information regarding
the dream of Clytaemnestra in the *Choephoroe* of Aeschylus. Sopho-
cles, like Scribe, disposed of many necessary explanations early in his
plays.

Euripides rarely resorted to gradual elucidation. Von Arnim makes
the statement[1] that the exposition in some of Euripides's tragedies
is continued after the parodos, and cites the *Orestes* as an instance

[1] *De Prologorum Euripideorum Arte et Interpolatione*, Greifswald, 1882, p. 99:
" Nam cum plerumque, in antiquioribus maxime fabulis, tota expositio ipso pro-
logo absolvatur, ut actionis initium parodum statim sequatur, sunt nonnullae
Euripidis tragoediae, ubi etiam post parodum expositio continuatur. Cuius rei
luculentissimum exemplum *Orestes* praebet, cuius ἐπεισόδιον primum totum ad ex-
positionem pertinet."

of a play in which the first episode is entirely expository. It would be nearer the truth to say that the exposition is *repeated* after the parodos. The first episode of the *Orestes*, with the exception of lines 268–270, which contain an obviously incidental allusion to the bow that Apollo gave to Orestes, is simply a repetition of facts already related in the prologue. Indeed, all through the play, after the delivery of the prologue, the audience learned little that is new concerning the past. They heard something of Oeax for the first time at lines 431–433. At line 1090 they were informed that Pylades planned the deed for which Orestes now pays the penalty. But the casual way in which the poet revealed these not unimportant facts almost shocks us after the deliberate preparations of Aeschylus for elucidation. Euripides, in general, seldom provided further explanations after the prologue, and made no attempt to hold back the revelation of certain points until the moment when the disclosure for dramatic reasons would be most telling. Poseidon, in the prologue of the *Troiades*, proclaims the fate of many captives, but the spectators first heard of the fate of Andromache at line 273, and of the assignment of Hecuba to Odysseus at line 277. At lines 914 ff. Helen gives several new details relating to her past. But the purpose of Euripides in reserving these facts for announcement after the prologue was not so much to produce dramatic suspense or to mould more delicately his characters, as simply to add to the overwhelming pathos of the tragedy by prolonging the sad tale of the captive women's lot. In the *Heraclidae*, the poet did not announce until lines 986 ff. that the hostility of Eurystheus to Heracles was involuntary and caused by the power of Hera. The information creates no climax at this point, but wins sympathy for Eurystheus. Euripides was as deeply interested in emotional effects as Sophocles in characterization or Aeschylus in problems of construction.

4. The Forms of Exposition

Exposition in Greek tragedy assumes, in general, three aspects. In choral passages it has a lyric form; it may appear as direct narration or dialogue; it may be dramatized.

The drama, as Richard Burton [1] suggests, is unlike other forms of story telling in its substitution of direct visualized action for the in-

---

[1] *How to See a Play*, New York, 1915, p. 3.

direct narration of fiction. He might have added that both the direct and the indirect methods of exposition were employed by the Greek tragic poets, for the choral odes of Greek tragedy reproduce the past in the indirect manner of the short story or the novel. This form of exposition is most conspicuous in the tragedies of Aeschylus. The chorus of Sophocles maintains an attitude of aloofness from the action that enables it to reflect serenely upon the abiding elements in the transient experiences of human existence. It is ever the idealist. Hence, the poet could scarcely employ it to any great extent for the elucidation of the past. In some of the tragedies of Euripides, the chorus, easily swayed by the impulses of the moment, is too human to unfold the past dispassionately. But the narrative element in many of his choral odes is very noticeable, and here, as often, his methods are comparable to those of Aeschylus. The chorus of the latter, however, is more consistently impersonal. It may occasionally, as has been observed, become the mouthpiece of the poet's religious or ethical convictions. It is more often the medium through which he was enabled to paint a marvelously vivid picture of events preceding the action of the drama. Although the average choral part in Aeschylus is about twice as large as the average choral part in either Sophocles or Euripides,[1] exposition by means of the indirect method is not correspondingly frequent in the tragedies of Aeschylus. But he, more often than the other poets, was likely to devote an entire choral passage, with the possible exception of a few introductory or concluding lines, to the reproduction of the past. Of such a character is the parodos of the *Supplices* (1–39) and the song (524–599) that describes the experiences of Io. The parodos of the *Persae* (1–64), the story of the departure of the Persian host (65–139), and the account of the successful reign of Darius (852–908), are also expository lyrics. In the *Septem*, a long choral passage (720–791) is entirely devoted to an unfolding of the unhappy careers of Laius and of Oedipus. The parodos of the *Agamemnon* (40–103) and the first stasimon (104–257) similarly explain the circumstances that preceded the arrival of the Greeks at Troy. The parodos of the *Choephoroe* (22–83) is also expository in character.

[1] Cf. A. E. Phoutrides, *The Chorus of Euripides, Harvard Studies in Class. Phil.*, Vol. XXVII, 1916, pp. 79-81.

There are similar passages in Sophocles and Euripides. The parodos of the *Antigone* (100–161) describes most vividly the attack of Poly- nices and the Argives upon Thebes. In the *Heracles* of Euripides, the first stasimon (348–441) is occupied with the story of the labors of the hero; the tale of the wooden horse forms the subject-matter of a choral ode in the *Troiades* (511–567); in the *Hecuba*, the occurrences of the night when Troy was captured are related in an exceedingly beautiful lyric (905–952). But such a procedure was unusual for these two poets. In the *Oedipus Coloneus*, there is not a single choral passage that describes antecedent events. Occasionally, the lyrics of Sophocles and Euripides provide a few new details in regard to the past, but no extensive exposition. In the *Philoctetes*, the chorus allude (681–686) to the innocence of the hero's life before his affliction, and in the *Electra* of Sophocles, brief mention is made in a choral part (505–515) of the chariot race of Pelops. The chorus in the *Orestes* of Euripides relate (819 ff.) the details of Clytaemnestra's death at the hands of Orestes, and touch upon (960–1012) the woes of Pelops's house. Some choral odes in the tragedies of Aeschylus are similarly constructed. The marriage of Prometheus is mentioned (555–560) in one of the lyrics of the *Prometheus*, and other brief references to the past are introduced into several choral passages of the *Supplices*,[1] the *Agamemnon*,[2] the *Choephoroe*,[3] and the *Eumenides*.[4] Sometimes a lyric alludes to the past, but does not furnish additional exposition beyond that already provided. Thus in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the chorus mention (907–910) the oracles that Laius heard of old.[5] In the *Ajax*, allusion is made by the chorus (172 ff.) to the attack of Ajax upon the cattle of the Greeks, the story of which Athena had previously related to Odysseus.[6] The chorus of the *Trachiniae* in a beautiful ode repeat (497–350) Deianira's account of her wooing.[7] Two of the choral passages of the *Phoenissae* (784 ff; 1019 ff.) allude to the ravages of the Sphinx, a matter already explained in the pro- logue.[8]

If sufficient emphasis has not been put upon the fact that every Greek tragedy is, to a greater or less degree, a backward-written

[1] 40–175.
[2] 355–487; 681–809.
[3] 306–478; 935–972; 1065–1076.
[4] 143–177.
[5] Cf. 711–714.
[6] Cf. 36 ff.
[7] Cf. 1 ff.
[8] Cf. 45 ff.

drama, it is equally true that the expositional character of the choral odes of Greek tragedy has not been adequately understood. To us this indirect mode of elucidation, this intrusion, as it were, of a purely narrative element into the drama, may seem unnatural. Beyond all doubt, it was a legitimate and popular method of exposition in the fifth century before Christ. Many of the so-called "interludes" of Euripides are really not irrelevant, if we regard these odes as the medium through which the poet was permitted to narrate the events of the past. Exposition in lyric passages is decorative rather than dramatic. In the plays of Euripides, especially, it is the pictorial quality of this kind of exposition that impresses us. In point of exquisite coloring and selection of picturesque details, Euripides was, in general, a more skilful painter with words than either Aeschylus or Sophocles. The story of the theft of the golden ram in the *Electra* (699–746) and the account which the women of Chalcis in the *Iphigenia Aulidensis* give (164–302) of what they saw in the camp of the Greek warriors at Aulis, are exquisite illustrations of Euripides's descriptive power. But Euripides in none of his tragedies reproduced the past with greater vividness or beauty of diction than Aeschylus in the lovely lines of the *Agamemnon* (227–247) which describe Iphigenia's death at Aulis:

> λιτὰς δὲ καὶ κληδόνας πατρῴους
> παρ' οὐδὲν αἰῶνα παρθένειόν τ'
> ἔθεντο φιλόμαχοι βραβῆς.
> φράσεν δ' ἀόζοις πατὴρ μετ' εὐχὰν
> δίκαν χιμαίρας ὕπερθε βωμοῦ
> πέπλοισι περιπετῆ παντὶ θυμῷ
> προνωπῆ λαβεῖν ἀέρ-
> δην, στόματός τε καλλιπρώ-
> ρου φυλακᾷ κατασχεῖν
> φθόγγον ἀραῖον οἴκοις,
>
> βίᾳ χαλινῶν τ' ἀναύδῳ μένει.
> κρόκου βαφὰς δ' ἐς πέδον χέουσα
> ἔβαλλ' ἕκαστον θυτή-
> ρων ἀπ' ὄμματος βέλει φιλοίκτῳ,
> πρέπουσα θ' ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς, προσεννέπειν

θέλουσ', ἐπεὶ πολλάκις
πατρὸς κατ' ἀνδρῶνας εὐτραπέζους
ἔμελψεν, ἁγνᾷ δ' ἀταύρωτος αὐδᾷ πατρὸς
φίλου τριτόσπονδον εὔποτμον
παιᾶνα φίλως ἐτίμα.

The passage illustrates, too, the brilliant constructive ability of the
poet. It is partly, but not primarily, expository in character. It
moves the past into the present more powerfully than almost any other
lines in Greek tragedy. At the same time, it reconciles us to the
" taking off " of Iphigenia's father. Finally, like the other allusions
to the maiden's death, it furnishes the foundation for Clytaemnestra's
later defence of her crime.

Exposition by means of direct narration or dialogue is very frequent
in Greek tragedy. Here, again, the technique of Euripides is like that
of Aeschylus. It is only in the *Trachiniae* of Sophocles that we find
many long narrative passages, the content of which is explanatory of
the past. But the long speech in the *Orestes* of Euripides, where Orestes
talks to Tyndarus (544–604), is typical of many passages in Euripides
in which the poet made no attempt to dramatize the exposition. Simi-
larly, in the *Supplices* of Aeschylus, Pelasgus provides (249–273) a
frank account of himself for the benefit of Danaus and his daughters.
In other tragedies, the elucidation of the past, although equally
direct, is more skilful. Thus in the *Persae*, the narration of Atossa's
dream is admirable. She herself relates (176–200) her dream to the
chorus, and it is fitting that she should do so. In the *Choephoroe*, the
chorus explain the details of Clytaemnestra's dream, in order that
Orestes, by interpreting it in its true light, may be imbued with
greater courage for his deed. Furthermore, although Aeschylus in-
directly made it clear that Clytaemnestra has been the prey of fear,
he did not desire to exhibit her to the audience as actually terrified,
for she is marvelously mistress of herself even when the death of
Orestes is announced. Besides, it would have been inartistic for her
to narrate her dream in full just before her death. But the circum-
stances of the *Persae* are different, and Atossa is cast in a different
mould. She foreshadows the interest of Aeschylus in characterization
that is more conspicuous in Clytaemnestra. Certainly the poet took
pains to endow Atossa with a little of that elusive something we call

charm. Witness the lovely passage (598 ff.) where she describes with
so much grace the offerings she brings to Darius. Now by allowing
Atossa herself to explain her dream, Aeschylus has well brought out
her rather emotional temperament, as contrasted with the almost
virile self-restraint of Clytaemnestra. For Atossa in her fear seeks
reassurance from her councilors, and is filled with hope at their words
of encouragement (226 ff.). The facts of the dream in both the *Persae*
and the *Choephoroe* are so given as to make each tragedy most effective
for the development of the plot and for purposes of characterization.
In the *Septem*, the manner in which the poet makes plain the tempera-
ment of Eteocles is also highly commendable. It reveals increased
skill on the part of Aeschylus in employing the direct mode of expo-
sition, as compared with the same method in the *Supplices*. For
Eteocles, at the beginning of the tragedy, does not, like Danaus
(*Supp.* 176–177), proclaim his prudence and trustworthiness. Rather,
he shows that he possesses these qualities by announcing his lofty
conception of the duty of a ruler (1–3) and by his harsh rebuke to the
shrieking chorus (181 ff.).

In the *Prometheus*, the method of exposition by direct narration
prevails; there is scarcely any attempt to re-present the past dramati-
cally. It has been suggested that the tragedy in its present form is not
the original play as it proceeded from the hands of Aeschylus,[1] and a
study of the exposition in it leads to the same conclusion. The poet
was plainly embarrassed by the fact that the major part of the tragedy
is nothing but a reproduction of antecedent circumstances. But the
exposition at times is unnecessarily, and for Aeschylus, almost in-
credibly awkward. Let us consider first the opportunities which the
poet provided for Prometheus to narrate in detail his past experiences.
The Oceanids ask Prometheus (195–197) to tell them the reason why
Zeus is punishing him. Now since Oceanus himself had shared the
guilt of Prometheus (332–333), since his daughters had only with
difficulty persuaded their father to let them come to Prometheus
(130–131), and since they know that Zeus is the source of Prometheus's
present humiliation (150–151), it is really a mild *reductio ad absurdum*

---

[1] Cf. Bethe, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Theaters im Alterthum*, Leipzig, 1896,
pp. 138–185; C. B. Gulick, *The Attic Prometheus, Harvard Studies in Class. Phil.*,
Vol. X, 1899, pp. 103–114.

that they should not already have heard the cause of Prometheus's suffering. Sophocles exposed himself to like criticism in his *Philoctetes*, where Odysseus, as soon as he reaches land (1 ff.), explains to Neoptolemus in full the reason for the expedition, although it is absurd to suppose that Neoptolemus has been kept in ignorance. Besides, there are several passages which inconsistently represent Neoptolemus as having knowledge of the facts that Odysseus tells him. To cite one instance, it would appear, when the drama opens, that Neoptolemus knows nothing of the oracle relating to Philoctetes (cf. 68–69; 101; 112–113). But later on (1339–1341), the spectators hear from the lips of Neoptolemus himself that this oracle had predicted the fall of Troy in this very year, a point which neither Odysseus nor any other character in the play explains to Neoptolemus. Sophocles obviously desired to make the situation plain to the audience at the beginning of the play. For the same reason, Aeschylus in his *Philoctetes* was at fault in permitting Philoctetes to narrate his sufferings to the chorus. The excuse which Dio Chrysostom proffers on behalf of Aeschylus is ingenious, not to say magnanimous, but not convincing.[1]

In the *Prometheus*, the incredible ignorance of the daughters of Oceanus is of course, dramatically speaking, a mere peccadillo, but that the tragedy is really weak on its constructive side is more evident in the passage (620–621) where Prometheus refuses to tell Io why he is being punished. His refusal could be explained as a poet's avoidance of the needless repetition of facts which have already been set forth in detail to the chorus on two occasions.[2] But one of these expository passages might easily have been reserved for the enlightenment of Io's legitimate curiosity, in which case Prometheus could have enjoyed the double sympathy of Io and the chorus. It would be better to transfer to the scene where Io appears the first of these two passages, (199–260), rather than the second (436–506), which is excellent as it stands. The preceding ode (399 ff.) makes possible the telling silence of Prometheus which surely is not to be ascribed

[1] Cf. Dion Chryst. *Or.* 52, 550 M, ed. L. Dindorf, Leipzig, 1857, Vol. II, pp. 159–160: οὐ τοίνυν οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνο δοκεῖ μοι δικαίως ἄν τις αἰτιάσασθαι, τὸ διηγεῖσθαι πρὸς τὸν χορόν, ὡς ἀγνοοῦντα τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀπόλειψιν τὴν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ τὰ καθόλου συμβαίνοντα αὐτῷ. οἱ γὰρ δυστυχοῦντες ἄνθρωποι πολλάκις εἰώθασι μεμνῆσθαι τῶν συμφορῶν καὶ τοῖς εἰδόσιν ἀκριβῶς καὶ μηδὲν δεομένοις ἀκούειν ἐνοχλοῦσιν ἀεὶ διηγούμενοι.

[2] 199–260; 436–506.

solely to the practical limitations of the Greek theatre.[1] At line
278 the narration of Prometheus's future sufferings to the chorus is
interrupted by the entrance of Oceanus. But after his exit, Prome-
theus (436 ff.), instead of resuming his tale to the chorus, proceeds
to brood over the contrast between his present state of misery and his
alleviation of the misery of mankind which he narrates in detail,
oblivious to his future woe. It is a highly artistic touch, calculated
to emphasize the indignity that Prometheus feels he is now suffering.
But since the audience was acquainted with the situation at the be-
ginning of the play in the prologue, the Oceanids upon their entrance
might easily have been represented as knowing the cause of Prome-
theus's plight, so that detailed reference to the past at this point
would be unnecessary. If the explanations of lines 199–260 were
deferred until the appearance of Io, the space they occupy in the play
could be devoted to an expression of sympathy for Prometheus from
the Oceanids. The device that the poet adopted for the detailed
exposition of Io's history is better, although not particularly subtle.
When Prometheus is about to tell Io her future (630), the Oceanids
interrupt him with the petition that they may first know her past
(631–634). At lines 283 ff. Prometheus insists upon recounting to
Io the course of her wanderings before she came to him on the plea
that he can thus convince her that his prophecy of the future is true.
This is another awkward device for introducing allusions to the past.
Prometheus uses the best method in fact, but not in art, to win Io's
belief. In short, the reproduction of the past by the direct method
in the *Prometheus* seems labored as compared with the use of the same
method in the other tragedies of Aeschylus.

Direct narration and dialogue are employed in the *Agamemnon*
with far more facility. In the passages where Clytaemnestra describes
to the messenger (587–614) and to Agamemnon (855–913) her loyal
life as a wife during her husband's absence, the explication of ante-
cedent conditions by direct narration is highly effective. Clytaem-
nestra's insincerity and audacity are so stamped on every word she
utters that the dramatic tension, especially in her interview with
Agamemnon, is very great. It is the tremendous irony of such narra-

---

[1] Cf. F. W. Dignan, *The Idle Actor in Aeschylus*, The University of Chicago
Press, 1905, pp. 21 ff.

tive passages in the *Agamemnon* that imparts to them their power, and to the entire play a large portion of its intensely tragic atmosphere. The messenger's speech also (503 ff.), where the poet adopted the same direct mode of exposition, is more effective than the messenger's report in the *Persae* (249 ff.). The poet bestowed upon the speaker in the *Agamemnon* such a clear-cut and interesting individuality of his own that the primarily explanatory purpose of the passage is scarcely apparent. The frequent reproduction of the past by direct narration in the *Choephoroe* is highly suitable. The method here enhances the solemn dignity and consecrated purpose of Orestes.

The trial of Orestes in the *Eumenides* is the best illustration in Greek tragedy of the dramatization of the past. Horace might have cited this tragedy as an illustration of the first of his alternative precepts, *aut agitur res in scaenis, aut acta refertur*, for the exposition in the court scene is never simply exposition. It is a necessary part of the dramatic action. From the modern point of view, of course, this dramatized form of exposition seems most artistic. Curiously enough, in Greek tragedy, it often appears in a stichomythy, which is probably the oldest form of dialogue.[1] Examples, indeed, of undramatic stichomythies are not lacking. In the passage of the *Persae* which is introduced by the absurd question of Atossa (231) in regard to the site of Athens, the conversation has no direct bearing upon the present situation. The stichomythy in the *Electra* of Euripides between Electra and Orestes (220–289) is purely explanatory in character. But in the *Supplices*, the exposition provided in the conversation between Pelasgus and the Danaids (291–347) is admirable. The poet by employing this rapid stichomythy to work up to proof of the maidens' Argive descent dramatized the past, and created a slight tension. The *Oedipus Tyrannus* affords two examples of similarly dramatic stichomythies. The conversation of Oedipus with the messenger (1007–1046) and his dialogue with the shepherd (1149–1177) alike lead up to his discovery of the truth. In the *Iphigenia Taurica*, the stichomythy between Orestes and Iphigenia (494–569) is also an excellent instance of the dramatic revelation of the past, for it is the prelude to the ἀναγνώρισις. Sometimes the

---

[1] Cf. Adolph Gross, *De Stichomythiae in Tragoedia Comoediaque Graecorum Usu et Origine*, Pars Prima, Halle, 1904, pp. 25–26.

exposition of a long narrative passage is dramatized. In the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, Oedipus's terrible uncertainty as to whether Laius and the stranger whom he slew are one, imparts dramatic significance to his story of what happened at the crossroads (771–883). But such dramatic revelations of the past are unusual in Greek tragedy. The narrative element predominates in expository passages both in choral parts and elsewhere.

5. The Selection of Expository Details

The treatment of the myths by different poets was characterized by an astonishing diversity of details. It would seem essential, therefore, for a Greek tragic poet to make his own adaptation of a popular legend perfectly clear. Euripides generally did this. He was naturally interested in displaying the inventive ability with which he occasionally modified, in such a spectacular, if not melodramatic, fashion, the myths that had been the literary pabulum of the Greeks for so many years. Sophocles, too, did not hesitate to remould the old legends into a new shape which was more likely to facilitate successful characterization. Although he was less generous with explanations than Euripides, his innovations are generally plain. Aeschylus, on the other hand, not only introduced few novelties into the familiar plots, but also had no scruples about leaving unexplained many facts relating to the past which the other poets would probably have worked into the fabric of the drama. Sometimes, indeed, both Sophocles and Euripides were unconsciously obscure. In the *Trachiniae*, Sophocles nowhere lucidly stated that the oracle was inscribed on the tablet possessed by Deianira,[1] nor did Euripides in the *Iphigenia Aulidensis* explain fully the part of Odysseus in the scheme by which Iphigenia was to be obtained for sacrifice.[2] Sophocles was even more careless in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Why is the man who witnessed the murder of Laius reported (122–123) to have said that Laius was slain by robbers? The lie is very important, because it conceals the truth from Oedipus for a long time. But the poet nowhere explained this. It was characteristic of Aeschylus alone, however, deliberately to neglect all but those events of the past which he thought of the utmost

[1] Cf. 44–48; 76–77; 155–158; 1164–1171.
[2] Cf. 1362 ff.

importance for a given tragedy. What was the principle that governed his selection of these relatively few expository details? It is a commonplace of literary criticism to say that Aeschylus could hew like a Cyclops, but that he could not carve like a Praxiteles. It is undoubtedly true that he did not blur the dignity and grandeur of his tragedies by too great attention to details. It is equally true that he never lost his sense of the relative importance of the things of life. The repression of individual traits in his characters is very marked. He made no attempt to analyze the subtler, personal emotions. His concern was with the less transitory, more elemental passions common to all humanity. But Aeschylus did not touch upon many circumstances of the past solely or primarily because he wished to banish from the field of his vision everything that might distract his attention from the general impression of loftiness which he desired to impart to his tragedies. The chief principle which governed his selection of expository details was the best that a tragic poet of any age could adopt. With an eye, as always, to skilful construction, he chose to emphasize only those facts of the past which would tend to make his plays, as a whole, most successful from a dramatic point of view. Dramatic effectiveness, rather than an ingenious manipulation of an old plot or subtle characterization, was his first interest.

To illustrate this point briefly: An excellent example of Aeschylus's peculiar attitude toward the past is seen in the *Supplices*, where the poet did not touch upon any aspects of Io's experiences which he did not regard as important for the development of the drama. Although he put emphasis upon the miraculous birth of Epaphus,[1] he did not state whether or not Io recovered her human shape before Epaphus was engendered. All the discussions that I have read on this subject are unconvincing. Line 314,

$$\text{τίς οὖν ὁ Δῖος πόρτις εὔχεται βοός;}$$

is not enlightening, because from the point of view of one phase of her existence, she is, of course, potentially, always a βοῦς. Two passages [2] suggest that Io was restored to human shape, but this is nowhere stated definitely, and the allusions to Epaphus as the " Touch-born " [3] are perhaps against this interpretation. The matter has no particular

---

[1] 17, 40–48; 313–315; 514–581.   [2] 571–581; 1064–1067.   [3] 17, 45; 313.

dramatic significance for this play, and the poet, accordingly, did not enlarge upon it. But he was careful to make it plain that Hera, not Zeus, was responsible for the sufferings of Io.[1] Since the Danaids again and again ask Zeus to grant them safety, it was important that Aeschylus should lay stress upon the clemency and justice of the god to whom the maidens pray. The whole play rings with reverence for Zeus; it begins and ends with an appeal to him. The question as to whether he was not the first cause of Io's misery is not even suggested. The procedure of the poet in the *Prometheus*, as we shall see, was different. Aeschylus also explained in great detail the descent of the Danaids,[2] because upon this is based the plea of the maidens for Argive assistance.

In the *Persae*, in order that the ill-starred Xerxes might present the stronger contrast to the prosperous Darius, Aeschylus glossed over the actual defeats of the latter and exaggerated his successes.[3] Indeed, he represented him in all respects as the most fortunate of monarchs. On this subject the poet was most generous with details. He thus created in Darius a character who in point of energy and good fortune is an effective dramatic foil to the almost whimpering Xerxes.

In the *Septem*, as in the *Supplices*, Aeschylus left many events of the past veiled in complete mystery or touched but lightly upon them. He did not state, for instance, whether Eteocles or Polynices was the elder, or whether they were twins, an item that Sophocles made much of in the *Oedipus Coloneus*.[4] Here, too, we find merely an incidental allusion to the cause of the quarrel between the brothers [5] and to the death of Oedipus.[6] But the poet did explain antecedent circumstances that he thought were dramatically significant for this tragedy, for instance, the lugubrious history of the hapless house of Laius.[7]

In the *Prometheus*, it is not surprising that Aeschylus provided no explanations of how Oceanus came to share in the guilt of Prometheus.[8] It was not necessary for an understanding of the play that the spectators should be told of the former relations between Prometheus and Oceanus. But is is interesting to see that the poet realized that the

---

[1] Cf. 162–165; 294–307; 562–564; 586–589.   [2] 314–324.
[3] Cf. 554–557; 633–634; 652–656; 709–712; 779–781; 852–903.
[4] 1292–1298.   [6] 977–978; 1009.   [8] Cf. above, p. 196.
[5] 881–885.   [7] 720 ff.

dramatic demands of this tragedy required a treatment of the myth of Io very different from that of the *Supplices*. In the *Prometheus*, Zeus is represented as the primary cause of Io's misery.[1] The case of Prometheus against Zeus is thereby made the stronger, and more sympathy is secured for both Io and the unfortunate hero of the tragedy. Several passages might seem to show that Hera does not escape unscathed,[2] but all of them are tinged with irony, especially lines 589–592, and imply greater blame on the part of Zeus. He, forsooth, is aflame with love for Io; yet he now permits her to suffer at Hera's hands!

The poet was similarly reticent in the *Agamemnon* with regard to many events occurring before the opening of the play. He did not tell, for instance, how Aegisthus succeeded in winning the friendship and, at length, the love of Agamemnon's wife, nor did he explain whether Clytaemnestra sinned after persuasion, as in the *Odyssey*,[3] or willingly from the first. But he gave a definite answer to Pindar's question[4] as to Clytaemnestra's motive for slaying her husband, because this was the best possible dramatic justification for her crime. Furthermore, the parts that Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus respectively play in the murder are much clearer than in Homer whose accounts are somewhat confusing.[5] Aegisthus is certainly the murderer in Homer; but in some instances he is said to have devised the plot, in others, to have been assisted by the queen. In the *Agamemnon*, however, Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus stand out plainly, the one as the slayer, the other as the plotter. Aeschylus thus produced in them two tragic characters of effectively contrasting temperaments.

In the *Choephoroe*, far more conspicuously than in his other tragedies, the poet was oblivious to all antecedent occurrences not directly concerned with the action of the drama. For the reason which I have already mentioned,[6] it was necessary that he should consume as little time as possible in exposition. And so he said nothing of the life of Orestes before he came back to his father's house on his avenging

---

[1] Cf. 577–584; 663–672; 734–738; 757–759.
[2] Cf. 589–592; 703–704; 899–900.
[3] 3, 265 ff.
[4] *Pyth.* 11, 22 ff.
[5] Cf. *Odyssey* 3, 193–194; 249–250; 303–305; 4, 529; 11, 409–411.
[6] Cf. above, p. 199.

errand, but much of Loxias's oracle and of the cruel crime of Cly-
taemnestra and Aegisthus. All these details are important factors in
the evolution of the plot.

The exposition of the past in the *Eumenides* is, for Aeschylus, re-
markably minute. But full explanations are demanded by the plot
in general, and by the court scene in particular. The dramatic
exigencies of this play enforce the careful re-presentation of the past.
If it is the business of a playwright, when he would transform a story
into a drama, to choose only the most significant details, in order that
he may produce the highest emotional effects by an elimination of all
unimportant elements, then Aeschylus was more dramatic than either
Sophocles or Euripides. Unlike them, he gave to the familiar legends
an extraordinary intensity of treatment. He was an adept in
the art of emphasizing just those events of the past which, when
introduced into the action of the present, would make each of his
tragedies a very powerful dramatic performance.

For another reason, too, Aeschylus's choice of expository details is
to be distinguished from the method of Sophocles or Euripides. It
is to be regretted that the modern " problem play " is so narrow in
its scope as to deal with only one phase of moral life. Otherwise, the
term could appropriately be applied to the tragedies of Aeschylus.
Perhaps the most characteristic feature of his exposition was his
tendency so to treat certain occurrences of the past as to raise but
not to settle the question whether these were rightly or wrongly
done. In other words, each of his tragedies contains at least one moral
problem that is as far from a satisfying solution at the end of the
play as it was at the beginning. Aeschylus may have believed in art
for art's sake. He certainly did not believe in art for morality's sake
to the extent that the poet Thomson did, who prefixed to his *Aga-
memnon* the naïve announcement:

> " Important is the moral we would teach:
>   (O may this island practice what we preach)."

The method of Aeschylus was to suggest the moral dilemma, to stim-
ulate the consciences of his audience, but never to think out the
situation to its logical conclusion for them.

The moral problems presented in the tragedies of Sophocles are
less baffling. The guilty may suffer, as in the case of Ajax, who dies

so wretchedly because, as the poet was careful to explain,[1] he had
sinned against Athena before he came to Troy. The innocent too,
as in life, may meet with unmerited affliction. Critics who are loath
to admit that an innocent person is a suitable subject for a tragic
doom generally take refuge in one of two theories: they refer the down-
fall of such a character to the workings of a hereditary curse, or they
seek for the manifestation of a subtle and not unpardonable sin which
leads to punishment and consequent purification. But there are
really innocent characters in some of Sophocles's plays. Antigone
could scarcely be more perfect and yet human too. The principles
of poetic justice may not be satisfied in her case, but she is an intensely
tragic figure. To her we may apply the words which Heracles ad-
dresses to Philoctetes:[2]

> καὶ σοί, σάφ' ἴσθι, τοῦτ' ὀφείλεται παθεῖν
> ἐκ τῶν πόνων τῶνδ' εὐκλεᾶ θέσθαι βίον.

A life, even a sinless one, may be made glorious by suffering. Some-
times Sophocles thought of the will of Heaven as combining with the
sinful heart of man to work disaster. Thus in the *Oedipus Coloneus*,[3]
Ismene says of her brothers:

> νῦν δ' ἐκ θεῶν του κἀλιτηρίου φρενὸς
> εἰσῆλθε τοῖν τρὶς ἀθλίοιν ἔρις κακή,
> ἀρχῆς λαβέσθαι καὶ κράτους τυραννικοῦ.[4]

The poet's attitude of mind toward other characters of both first and
second rank is not so clearly defined. Did he regard Oedipus and
Deianira as innocent or guilty persons? It would be difficult for us
to give a definite answer to this question, but I do not believe that
Sophocles intended to mystify his audience. He was rather engrossed
in the creation of great tragic characters whose misfortunes it was
unnecessary to explain, in every case, by a theory of life as valid as
that by which the guilty may be punished, or the innocent ennobled,
through suffering. What distinguishes the method of Sophocles from
that of Aeschylus is that the latter in his tragedies consciously created
a moral controversy which, by suggesting arguments for either side,
he held so suspended throughout the play, that a just decision on the
side of right is impossible at the end.

[1] *Aj.* 758–779.   [2] *Ph.* 1421–1422.   [3] 371–373.   [4] Cf. *Ant.* 620–624.

The tragedies of Euripides, though sometimes argumentative, are seldom problematical in tone. Having introduced some spirited dialogues into the drama proper, often, at the end, the poet suddenly shifted all moral responsibility from his characters to the gods themselves, or to fate, so that any discussion of the innocence or guilt of his *dramatis personae* is absurd. In the *Electra* (1266–1267), the Dioscuri cheerfully assert that Apollo will take upon himself the guilt of Orestes; later (1301–1302), they say that fate, plus necessity, plus the commands of Apollo, decreed the death of Clytaemnestra. Something of the same unmoral atmosphere pervades the *Hippolytus* (1325–1328), where Artemis frees Theseus from all blame by explaining that Hippolytus had angered Aphrodite. In the *Helen* (1660–1661), the responsibility for the Trojan expedition is similarly transferred to the gods and to destiny. The Greek point of view in the *Ion*, which has much in common with a problem play of today, is naturally very different from the modern. The youthful transgression of Xuthus receives merely casual mention (545), although the dénouement of the play depends upon it, for we must assume Xuthus's acceptance of Ion as his son.[1] But in view of the many suggestions of fault on the part of Apollo throughout the play, the sweeping but not very convincing absolution that Athena pronounces for the god at the end (1595 ff.) is rather more startling.

The Aeschylean manner of so manipulating the exposition as to give a problematical aspect to the events of the past will perhaps be clearer if we examine each of his tragedies. In the *Supplices*, it is a disputable question whether the sons of Aegyptus have right on their side in demanding marriage with the Danaids. For the maidens do not answer the prayer of Pelasgus (387–391) in regard to the possible legal claims of their cousins upon them, but simply express the desire (392–396) that they may escape the abhorred marriage. The conversation of the herald with Pelasgus later in the play (911–918), in the course of which the former asserts his right to take away his own property, is no more illuminating than the speech of Danaus (980–984), which contrariwise points to an injury done to his daughters by their cousins. The division of the chorus at the end of the play[2] is in perfect harmony with the poet's attitude of mind throughout the

---

[1] Cf. 1601–1602.   [2] Cf. below, pp. 218 ff.

entire drama. In the *Supplices*, it is to be observed that the problem
presented does not assume the tragic proportions of the moral issues
involved in the *Orestes*, but the poet's characteristic method is seen.
In this play, however, as always, he was careful to suggest sufficient
dramatic guilt to render reasonable the development of the plot.
Whether the sons of Aegyptus are in the right or not, they are certainly
too violent suitors, and their herald is an insolent messenger.

In the *Persae*, the ὕβρις of the Persians which has provoked the
vengeance of the gods against them, explains the catastrophe of the
tragedy. But the poet here was interested in the minor problem of
Xerxes's moral responsibility for the great disaster of his country.
Did Xerxes know of the oracles predicting the ruin of his empire, and
yet did he persist in his ambitious plans against Greece ? Line 829,

Δα.   πρὸς ταῦτ' ἐκεῖνον, σωφρονεῖν κεχρημένον,

is important for this discussion. If κεχρημένον is interpreted in the
literal sense of the word, it must refer to oracular information im-
parted to Xerxes. In that case, the line constitutes a reproof from
Darius, implying that Xerxes received an oracular message enjoining
the exercise of σωφροσύνη. But a later passage would seem to militate
against the supposition that Xerxes had been forewarned by an oracle
of danger to his kingdom, for he says (909–910) that his fate was
ἀτεκμαρτοτάτη, and that an unexpected calamity came upon him
(1026–1027). Other suggestions, however, as to the moral guilt of
Xerxes are less bewildering. Darius twice refers [1] to the sacrilegious
spirit of his son, and suggests that he overstepped the bounds of a
legitimate ambition. He also mentions specifically (782–783) the sin
of disobedience. In lines 923–924 the chorus speak reproachfully of
Xerxes as the Ἄιδου σάκτορι Περσᾶν. On the other hand, excuses are
offered for him. Atossa says (473–477) that Xerxes's purpose in going
to Greece was to avenge the defeat at Marathon, and she also asserts
(753–758) that evil men influenced her son by taunting him with
his life of idleness at home.

The *Septem* is a better example of an Aeschylean problem play.
The uncontrolled passion of Eteocles is the dramatic prelude to his
death, and the poet suggested enough guilt on the part of both brothers

[1] 744–746; 830–831.

to supply the motive for the catastrophe, — namely, the fact that Eteocles and Polynices had once incurred the fatal wrath of their father who prayed that they might divide his heritage with the sword. But whether the claims of Polynices or Eteocles carry with them the weight of justice is never clearly proclaimed. If Eteocles often seems to be in higher favor with the poet, it is simply because he is the hero, so to speak, of the tragedy, the defender of a besieged city, and because from the Greek point of view to attack one's native town was an almost unpardonable sin. The herald announces (1012–1016) that it has been decreed to bury Eteocles in return for his good will toward the land, and because he chose death that he might ward off the enemy from his native city, whereas Polynices (1018–1024) must forfeit the rights of burial as the penalty for bringing a foreign host to capture Thebes. When Antigone threatens (1050) to bury Polynices, the herald upholds the policy of the state by reminding her (1055) that the weapons of Polynices were directed against all, not against one. The reason which half of the chorus advances (1078 ff.) for not resisting the commands of the herald is that Eteocles, next to the blessed gods and mighty Zeus, did most to save his city from ruin. But as a matter of fact, Eteocles, as well as Polynices, receives his full share of censure in the course of the play. Amphiaraus refers (580–583) in scathing tones to Polynices's attack against his native city; yet he implies that his cause was just (584):

$$\mu\eta\tau\rho\grave{o}s \ \tau\epsilon \ \pi\eta\gamma\grave{\eta}\nu \ \tau\acute{\iota}s \ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\beta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota \ \delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta \, ;$$

And justice herself is depicted on the shield of Polynices (642–648). Eteocles, nevertheless, declares (662–667) that Justice has never attended on his brother, and that she would be falsely named if she joined him now. Yet Antigone says (1054) that Polynices did but requite evil with evil. The division of the chorus at the end of the tragedy is in harmony with the problematical tone of the entire drama. Many scholars regard the last scene as a later addition to the original tragedy. Professor Smyth holds that its style is often not Aeschylean, and doubts its genuineness. But our modern taste, which would demand a reconciliation in the closing scene, should not blind our eyes to the fact that Aeschylus really created a new type of tragedy in this third play of a trilogy. Moreover, that the feelings of the Greeks on

this subject were unlike the modern, is proved by the ending of plays like the *Oedipus Coloneus*, where Antigone entreats Theseus (1769–1772) to send her and Ismene to Thebes that they may avert the bloodshed of their brothers. The spectators were left in a state of uncertainty as to what the outcome of the mission would be. Similarly, the *Supplices* of Euripides ends with a general prophecy of the wars of the Epigoni (1219 ff.), and with Theseus's promise to exact the oath from Adrastus (1229) to which previous reference has been made (1191 ff.). It is not necessary, therefore, if we would maintain that the last scene of the *Septem* is part of the original tragedy, to say with Verrall[1] that the poet intended to develop the motive therein suggested in another play resembling the *Antigone* of Sophocles.

In the *Prometheus*, the guilt of Prometheus is sufficient to explain the catastrophe, for it is obvious that he has sinned. Even his friend and kinsman Hephaestus rebukes him (29–30); the Oceanids, who sympathize with him, refer openly to his offence (261–263); and Prometheus himself admits that he has sinned deliberately (268). But the depth of his real transgression, whether it be that of self-will or disobedience, is obscured not only by the fact that he has sinned from a high, perhaps even praiseworthy motive, but also by the many suggestions in the play of injustice in the punishment meted out to him. Violent vituperation of Zeus is to be expected from the fettered benefactor of mankind, but other more disinterested characters in the tragedy affirm that Zeus, as a new ruler, is, in general, harsh, and, in particular, cruel in his dealings with Prometheus. Such is the opinion of Hephaestus (34–35), Kratos (76–77), the chorus (149–151; 160–167), and Oceanus himself (324–326). The ingratitude of Zeus to Prometheus is also emphasized.[2] Again, Aeschylus left in tantalizing ambiguity the cause of Zeus's determination to destroy the human race, and whether or not it was right for Prometheus to preserve mankind. Wecklein,[3] without sufficient reason, states that the purpose of Zeus was to create a new and more perfect race, made as he would have them. Prometheus, apropos of Zeus's desire to destroy mankind, says simply (234–235):

[1] *The Seven Against Thebes of Aeschylus*, London, 1788, Introduction, pp. xxxii–xxxiii.

[2] 221-225; 306–308; 439–440; 985.

[3] *Äschylos Prometheus*, Leipzig, 1893, Introduction, p. 14.

ἀλλ' ἀιστώσας γένος
τὸ πᾶν ἔχρῃζεν ἄλλο φιτῦσαι νέον.

The moral issues involved in the present and pristine relations of Zeus with Prometheus remain obscure throughout the tragedy. The closest examination of the text does not lead to any satisfactory solution of the question, and the example of the *Septem* would support the conjecture that the matter was not necessarily cleared up in any later play of the trilogy.

In the *Agamemnon*, for dramatic reasons, it was necessary that the poet should prepare his audience for the death of the king. He therefore took pains to display the weaker side of the man, his coldness, pride, and arrogance, and by several implications of guilt intimated that his untimely end was not undeserved. At line 450 ff., for instance, he threw out the suggestion that the Atridae were looked upon as responsible for the tremendous loss of life at Ilium.[1] But he outlined only faintly the psychology of Agamemnon's past experiences which he may have thought partial justification for his death. The intimations that he has sinned, prior to the opening of the play, are many, but it is impossible to decide just how far Aeschylus regarded Agamemnon as morally culpable. In the first place, the offence of Agamemnon that had aroused the anger of Artemis is much more obscure than in the *Electra* of Sophocles,[2] because of the occult phraseology of the omen of the eagles and the hare (114–121) which Calchas interprets with reference to Artemis (134 ff.). Furthermore, to what degree was Agamemnon guilty in sacrificing Iphigenia? Upon the death of the maiden depended the capture of Troy (198–202); besides, we are constantly reminded that Zeus[3] or Fate[4] had decreed the expedition against the city of Paris. This would seem to imply that Agamemnon was a helpless instrument in the hands of powers mightier than man. Yet the poet represented him as hesitating (206 ff.) as if choice were possible, when he weighs in the balance his reluctance to undertake the unnatural sacrifice with his duty to his allies. Line 218,

ἐπεὶ δ' ἀνάγκας ἔδυ λέπαδνον,

[1] Cf. also 341–349; 369–372; 527; 785 ff.   [2] 563 ff.
[3] Cf. 60–67; 362–368; 522–526; 581–582; 746–749.
[4] Cf. 128–130; 156–157.

is apposite, for it is a perfect illustration of Aeschylus's method of treating this problem and others like it. The verb is active, and points to the exercise of free will on the part of Agamemnon, as do also lines 220–221,

$$τόθεν$$
$$τὸ παντότολμον φρονεῖν μετέγνω,$$

and lines 224–225,

$$ἔτλα δ' οὖν θυτὴρ γενέ-$$
$$σθαι θυγατρός.$$

But it was the yoke of necessity that Agamemnon put on. To a certain extent, then, the act of Agamemnon was unavoidable; to a certain extent, he was morally accountable for it. It is the eternal problem of free will, presented with a characteristically Aeschylean reserve as to the processes of thought by which Agamemnon finally resolved to sacrifice his child.

Neither Wilamowitz nor Plüss, whose opinions differ widely on this subject, has really understood the attitude of Aeschylus. Wilamowitz [1] believes that the poet intended to represent Agamemnon as indisputably guilty in slaying his daughter: "Andererseits sind wir durch die halb rätselhaften Worte des Wächters darauf vorbereitet, dass es nicht sowohl der Fall von Ilion als das Schicksal Agamemnons ist, um das wir uns sorgen sollen. Das macht uns empfänglich für die Erzählung von seiner Verschuldung: denn der Chor lässt keine Zweifel darüber, dass die Opferung der Iphigeneia trotz Artemis eine Sünde ist; oder vielmehr die καλά, die selbst an den Löwenjungen ihre Freude hat, kann das gar nicht gewollt haben; damit bestreitet der Dichter die Geschichten von Göttern, die Menschenopfer heischen; er denkt wie Goethes Iphigenie "der missversteht der Himmlischen, der sie blutgierig wähnt." Er hält sich nur von der offenen Anklage fern, wie sie die Iphigeneia des Euripides erhebt. Der Chor hat mit der Erklärung, dass kein Beschwichtigungsopfer hilft, zunächst über Paris, für uns auch über Agamemnon das Urteil gesprochen, oder genauer gesagt, der Dichter hat uns gleich die Weisung gegeben, von welchem religiös-sittlichen Standpunkte aus wir die Handlung ansehen sollen, die er vorführt." Plüss, on the other hand,

---

[1] *Aischylos Interpretationen*, pp. 165–166.

who interprets the *Agamemnon* as a "Schicksaltragödie" in the highest
sense of the word, maintains [1] that Agamemnon is absolutely inno-
cent: "Agamemnon kommt nach unserem Dichter zur Opferung
Iphigeniens durch göttlichen Zwang und ohne Schuld eigener Leiden-
schaft." He comments [2] on the contradictory points of view reflected
in many choral passages of the tragedy, as affording proof that the
poet cannot have desired to provide any consistent moral message:
"Auch diejenige Gerechtigkeit, von der im Stücke, zumal in den
Worten des Chores, ausdrücklich die Rede ist, ist nicht die gesuchte,
und wo sie dieser ähnlich sieht, steht sie in eigentümlichem Gegensatz
zur Handlung und im Widerspruch mit der Darstellung an andern
Stellen: überhaupt sind die Widersprüche in den Aeusserungen so
zahlreich und so stark, dass der Dichter nicht durch den Chor kann
lehren wollen." Here Plüss shows keener insight into the real nature
of the *Agamemnon* than Wilamowitz, but he fails to realize that
Aeschylus intended to make the play problematical.

In the *Choephoroe*, there is but one brief controversy relating to
events of the past, — the conversation of Orestes and Clytaemnestra
(908 ff.) just before the latter's death, when she attempts to justify
her deeds. The attitude of both mother and son is concisely but
vigorously disclosed. Aeschylus, however, did not prejudice his
audience by representing either as compelled by sheer force of logic
or of eloquence to yield to the other. Clytaemnestra dies, not as the
result of her altercation with her son, but because of his predeter-
mined resolution to avenge his father. The morality or immorality
of Orestes's act is still open to discussion.

The *Eumenides* is practically nothing but an investigation into the
moral problems of the past. The righteousness or unrighteousness
of Orestes's decision to fulfil the commands of Loxias is an ever-
present subject for a dispute that comes to no satisfactory conclusion.
Apollo assumes [3] the responsibility for Clytaemnestra's death, but
when the question arises whether the act of Orestes was just or not,
Apollo, evading a direct response, asserts [4] that all his oracles proceed
from Zeus. This would seem, perhaps, to be a solution of the dilemma
quite in the manner of Euripides, but actually Orestes is released,
not because he executed the divine command of Apollo, but because

---

[1] *Die Tragoedie Agamemnon und das Tragische*, Basel, 1896, p. 7.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 30.   [3] 84; 202–203; 579–580.   [4] 614–621.

it happens to be the purely arbitrary caprice of Athena to grant him her favor. Born of no woman, but in all things, save for marriage, approving the male, she casts her vote in favor of Orestes, and makes his father's cause her own (734–741). The *Eumenides* differs from the other tragedies of Aeschylus only in the detailed discussion of the moral questions involved in the trial of Orestes. The results reached are as inconclusive as those of the other plays.

Thus we see that Aeschylus was the inventor of a type of problem play which treated of many more aspects of human experience than the problem play of to-day. Here, as always, in dramatic criticism the question occurs: to what extent are the thoughts of the characters simply dramatic? How far do they reproduce the personal feelings of the poet? Did Aeschylus believe that there are problems that human logic cannot solve? In the case of choral passages, there is perhaps more reason for attributing the thoughts of the *dramatis personae* to the poet himself, yet even here we must proceed cautiously. Witness the absurd extremes of belief and unbelief into which Euripides is brought, if we regard the contradictory statements of his choral passages as revelations of his own faith. But with Aeschylus, I am sure that we are on firmer ground, especially where the songs of the chorus are concerned, although the chorus of Aeschylus is never simply the *raisonneur* of French drama, the interpreter of the author's thought to the audience. The tragedies of Aeschylus reveal to us a poet who was not the consistent protagonist of orthodoxy that he is popularly supposed to have been. To be sure, he was untouched by doubt as regards belief in the divine guidance of the universe. The gods of Aeschylus are never the far-away, shadowy figures that the deities of Sophocles and Euripides often are. They seem really to exist. But Aeschylus, although a deeply religious poet, applied the principles of evolution to the conventional theology and morality of his age. His was a mind strong and alert enough to throw aside the traditions of the past, and think clearly for itself. He loved to pass beyond the forms and ceremonies that made up the letter of Greek religion in the fifth century before Christ, and brood upon the more abiding things of its spirit. The exposition in his tragedies is so manipulated as to give concrete expression to the problems in which he was interested, — the clash of faith with logic and human experience, and the dilemmas of right conduct.

CONCLUSION

Criticism that is destructive only, that reveals what a writer has not done, the pitfalls that he has not avoided, or the opportunities that he has not been quick to seize, is temptingly easy, even in the case of the three great tragic poets of Greece. Something of that kind of comment was unavoidable in this essay, but so far as possible, I have tried to show, in a constructive manner, the special problems in exposition that these dramatists had to face, and their individual methods and success in solving them. Of the three, Aeschylus was the greatest master of dramatic exposition. This is shown by his marvelous treatment of exposition in the *Oresteia*, where he endowed each play with its own tragic atmosphere without destroying the larger unity of the trilogy. His skill is also apparent in his original methods of making the situation clear at the beginning of each tragedy, in his admirable use of distributive exposition, and in his selection of effective explanatory details. He was more successful than either Sophocles or Euripides in so manipulating the exposition in his plays as to produce many desirable dramatic effects at the same time that he provided the necessary elucidation of the past. His technical dexterity is the more amazing because he found the drama in an inchoate state. He transformed it into an astonishingly perfect literary genre. Something of the difficulties of his task his tragedies display to us. Yet in spite of the years which since the time of Aeschylus have witnessed the constant development, and in this century, the veritable metamorphosis of dramatic art, his genius remains unchallenged.

SUMMARIES OF DISSERTATIONS FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D., 1916–17

ROBERT VINCENT CRAM.—*De Vicis Atticis.*

THERE are 127 Attic demes concerning the members of which something is known. The chief purpose of this dissertation has been to determine the relative importance of these demes between 508 and 30 B.C. The conclusion reached in this comparative study is that during the fifth century the men of the urban demes were the most influential in Athenian politics. In the fourth century the center of gravity shifted from the residents in the urban demes to the men of the shore, and there remained till the period of the Roman empire; in the last third of the third century, however, there was a great increase in the importance of the Mesogaia and a corresponding decrease in the city demes.

In the introduction, after a discussion of the nature of the material, the question is considered whether membership in a deme meant residence therein or merely registration in its official list. This question can not be answered with certainty, but there are several reasons for believing that the members enrolled in a deme actually resided there.

In Chapter I a brief consideration is given to the Athenian village communities in the "Middle Ages," their development, and the manner by which the synoikismos of Attica was effected. After a note on the Solonian naucraries, which in some measure played a part under the régime of Solon like that of the demes under Cleisthenes, the organization of the demes under the latter is described in detail and the significance of the changes he introduced is shown.

To make a comparative study of the demes, it was necessary to take all the names, the demotica of which are known, in Kirchner's *Prosopographia Attica*, Sundwall's *Nachträge*, and Plassart's list of the Delian gymnasiarchs published in 1912. The names thus taken are arranged chronologically, their family trees being determined where possible; all those that can be at all closely dated are assigned to that third of

the century in which their chief activities lay. Then the demes are arranged by trittyes according to the assignment of Milchoefer, Loeper, and Kirchner. The number of Athenians so arranged and compared is 12,640.

This comparison is made in two ways. Since the first method constitutes, in a manner, a proof of the second, the second is here explained first.

In Chapter III a comparison is made of all persons mentioned for any reason — political, religious, literary — in each third of a century, with the following categories omitted: women, men mentioned only as fathers, and persons whose names have been found only in sepulchral inscriptions. The results of this comparison prove the initial thesis that from the second third of the fourth century, if not earlier, until the time of the Roman empire, the Paralia was the most important section of Attica.

Since in such a comparison as this the element of chance enters to a greater or less extent into the preservation of the material, Chapter II is devoted to a substantiation of the results of Chapter III by a comparison from a different angle. A method of cross-sections, so to speak, is employed, and the following lists are compared:

1. Particularly famous men in each century who are not included in the following categories. 2. The generals of the fifth and fourth centuries. 3. The Athenian secretaries. 4. The more important boards of treasurers of the fifth and fourth centuries. 5. Citizens who performed any liturgy in the fourth century. 6. The diaitetai. 7. The prytaneis. 8. The ephebi. 9. The priests of Asklepios. 10. The priests of Serapis. 11. The Delian epimeletai and gymnasiarchs. 12. All Athenian citizens active on the island of Delos in the second and first centuries B. C.

The indications furnished by the lists in this cross-sectional study for the most part, especially in the case of the generals and the Athenians on Delos, substantiate the results reached by an examination of all the names collected in the *Prosopographia*. Melite, an urban deme, is best represented on the island of Delos; hence the conclusion that this deme was the principal seat of the mercantile and banking class in Attica at the end of the second century B.C. and the beginning of the first century. It is significant that the two demes next of

importance in the number of their representatives on Delos are Marathon and Myrrhinoutta, both situated on the east coast of Attica.

Finally, when the two new demes, Berenike and Apollonia, were created, they took the place of two old demes which now disappeared. These old demes were Pelekes and Hippotomadai.

WILLIAM C. GREENE.—*Quid de Poetis Plato censuerit.*

THE obvious inconsistencies in Plato's treatment of poetry, and the one-sided interpretations of his attitude put forward by modern writers, invite a new consideration of the "ancient quarrel between philosophy and poetry" of which he speaks. It is important, in particular, to discover the nature of the philosophy that is opposed to poetry, and to ask how far Plato really believed the opposition to be irreconcilable.

In the present dissertation, it is held that Plato's views are not capable of being schematized in quasi-mathematical form, but are rather the outcome of years of pondering, in which now one, now another phase of the problem held his interest; these phases, reflected in the several dialogues, are none the less evidences of a dogged attempt to reach a final doctrine, which, however, Plato was too wise ever to formulate exactly.

For Plato, the conception of "an ancient quarrel between philosophy and poetry" was no fiction. He realized that in earlier times poets had actually been condemned by philosophers, chiefly on the charge that their poems contained immoral elements. And traces of this charge are still to be found in Plato's own writings. But for him the problem lay even deeper; it involved the opposition of the world of sense and intuition to the world of thought and reason. Plato's greatest task in philosophy was the attempt to mediate between these worlds, notably by the hypothesis of ideas and by the criticism of this hypothesis. His treatment of poetry can be understood only when its development is observed in relation to the parallel development of the theory of ideas. It is, therefore, necessary to consider the conditions that led to the adoption of Plato's theory of knowledge, and to notice to what extent, in the several dialogues, he held perfect knowledge to be more

than an ideal of the imagination. For his view of poetry varied with his vacillating faith in the perfectibility of knowledge.

In the *Ion*, Plato weighs and rejects the ordinary notion of poetic inspiration, reserving for some later occasion a more adequate explanation of the value of poetry; here the poet's ignorance is contrasted merely with the knowledge of practical matters that is found in the expert. In the *Meno*, Plato hints at an absolute standard of truth; the poet is now, by contrast with him who has such a standard, placed on a level with the expert in practical affairs, but is not on that account condemned. In the *Symposium*, Plato sketches, as an ideal, the ultimate goal to which the lover of beauty, breaking away from sense and ascending by means of thought, should proceed; the works of actual poets are not here underestimated, except, of course, as they necessarily rank lower than the productions of the ideal activity that is to follow. In the *Phaedo*, Plato elaborates the distinction between sense and thought, but indicates the manner in which, by the use of the theory of ideas, the ascent may be made from sense to thought. In the early books of the *Republic*, because of an ethical interest, he restricts the province of poetry; but, far from depreciating it as imitative or as unable to deal with reality, he actually lays down principles by which it is to deal with reality. In the succeeding books of the *Republic*, he develops his hope of finding absolute knowledge by means of dialectic and the theory of ideas to such a point that, in the tenth book, for a moment he almost imagines himself to have attained it, and so spurns the poetry that clings to the world of sense. Here he resorts to methods that are hardly ingenuous, in order to contrast poetry as it exists with an ideal of philosophy. The very exaggeration of the argument suggests that Plato is here the special pleader, indulging in a dramatic gesture that is expressive of his conviction as a recent and ardent convert to philosophy, rather than of his considered and enduring attitude. In the *Phaedrus*, he returns to the problem of inspiration, relating it to the theory of ideas, and distinguishing the perfect experience of the ideal lover of beauty from the imperfect experience of the imitative poet; he shows clearly that the theory of ideas does not necessarily carry with itself a condemnation of poetry. In the *Laws*, he reopens in a more practical mood, the issues of the *Republic*, and waives the condemnation of poetry in favor

of a more temperate, though still an austere, acceptance of the art. Finally, scattered discussions in various dialogues give evidence of his attempts to explain how the arts can express universals in sensible forms.

In all these dialogues it appears that Plato was not setting down rigidly determined views, but was expressing the conflict between poetry and philosophy that raged in his own breast. Had he not himself been something like a poet, he could not have felt with such desperate seriousness the danger of poetry, or have resorted, in a rash moment, to the poet's gesture of exiling the poets; had he not been a philosopher, he could not have seen the heights to which poetry, regarded as an ideal, should climb. He did not, then, formulate a definite creed about the poetic faculty, and his special utterances are moulded by special interests. Accordingly, those interpreters are mistaken who attempt to make a sweeping generalization, — as that Plato condemned poetry, or that his real doctrine is contained in myths.

But in spite of all his inconsistencies, it is possible to see that Plato held during most of his career that thought and an understanding of life are possible only on the hypothesis that eternal forms exist, and that thought is ultimately an act of intuition which passes from the perception of particulars to these eternal forms. The absolute, for him, is both a principle of existence and a principle of goodness and beauty, and hence, in theory, can be approached either by a hypothetical science of dialectic or by the direct intuition of the lover of beauty. In practice, this goal is never attained, for both thought and aesthetic experience are corrupted by sense. Sensible objects and symbols may, however, put one in a way of approximating a vision of reality; and though the lover of beauty has to a certain degree a vision of reality, he can communicate this vision only by the imitation of it by means of sensible objects. If this imitation is regarded as true and valuable in itself, it is to be condemned; and since most contemporary poetry was content, Plato thought, to produce images without passing on to the ideal world, it was so far to be condemned. He recognized, however, that the poet might express eternal forms, and so far as he did so, he became a philosopher. In some such way Plato imagined that the " ancient quarrel between philosophy and poetry " might cease.

An appendix to this study summarizes the reasons for believing that the dialogues contain, in general, the views of Plato himself, rather than of Socrates, and in particular for holding that Plato was the author of the "theory of ideas."

CHARLES ROSS OWENS.—*Quo modo Tragici Graeci res naturales tractaverint.*

THE attitude of the Greeks and the Romans towards Nature has been treated in a general way by several writers of highest distinction, but the very fact that the treatment is of this general character has vitiated its value. We have been too ready to accept the ideas of Schiller and Humboldt and Ruskin and too little disposed to examine the evidence at our disposal, forgetting that it is very dangerous to include all Greeks or all Romans in one class. It is the individual we must look to and not to the whole state, nor yet to any group, however small, within the state. In the field of poetry, we must take into account the temperament of the poet and his outlook on life, his literary purposes, the merits or limitations of his technique — in a word, everything which distinguishes him from the mass of his fellows. Such is the task we have set ourselves in the study of the works of the three great tragedians. It is only through accuracy in the examination of the plays and an honest attempt to grasp the conscious or unconscious aesthetic and mechanical results that our conclusions can have value.

In the study made in the second chapter it is shown that the three poets are equally careful in making clear to us the scene of the play when the action takes place among natural surroundings. This was very important at a time when realistic stage scenery was yet unknown. Important, too, was it to make clear the time of the action, especially when for some particular effect, all or part of it took place by night. In many cases this exposition of time gives rise to poetry, beautiful in itself, but for the present, it is the mere mechanics of the play in which we are interested.

In the third chapter I deal with the more important problem of the aesthetic effects produced by descriptions of Nature. Each tragedian chooses from Nature such aspects as will harmonize with the spirit of

the whole play and intensify its impression on the minds of the audience. Descriptions are not merely introduced at a particular moment to heighten the emotions of the speaker by similarity or contrast, but rather, in many cases, Nature forms an apt accompaniment to the action and sentiment of the entire drama.

As the attitude of Euripides is especially important in understanding his plays and his relation to modern life, I devote the next two chapters almost exclusively to this poet. In the first of these I deal with his religious and philosophical conceptions in so far as they have a bearing on Nature. By examining other plays and fragments of plays, we can discover many of those ideas which have made the *Bacchae* seem a puzzle to many. There is really nothing in this play that is new or contradictory to the poet's earlier ideas; through this study of the religious attitude of Euripides towards Nature we can at least lessen the difficulties of the interpretation of this play. The *Hippolytus* and the *Ion* deserve special treatment in this discussion for they show the essential religious character of Euripides in his thoughts of Nature and of her powers.

As there has been a tendency to draw a hard and fast distinction between Classicism and Romanticism, I devote the fifth chapter to an attempt to discover the essential similarity of the ancient writers and modern Romanticists in the treatment of Nature. It is Euripides who comes nearest to the modern mind, and represents the transitional stage from the older poets to the modern. Although there are many similarities between Euripides' treatment and that of the Romanticists, there seems to be this one difference, that whereas the modern delights to set forth his own feelings in the presence of Nature, the characters in the plays of Euripides never do so.

The remainder of the study is taken up in showing in what ways the individual poets differ from each other in their treatment. Aeschylus shows a fondness for the unusual or the marvellous or even the grotesque in Nature. Sophocles is especially impressed by its spiritual rather than its physical aspect. Euripides shows the effects of his training as a painter, and, unless he is describing the intense quiet of Nature, he habitually sets forth a mental picture which we readily visualize.

GENERAL INDEX

Aeschylus, dramatic construction in, 145–148, 152–156, 191–199, 214, 224.

Agamemnon, 138–139, 178–179, 184, 185, 190–191, 197–199, 202, 203, 204, 208–209, 213, 220–222.

Agathon's *Flower*, 74.

Ajax, 171, 183, 192, 203, 214–215.

Alcestis, 176, 186, 192.

Andromache, 171.

Antigone, 171, 183, 199–200, 203.

Aristotle, dialogues of, and the relation of the work *On Poets* to the *Poetics*, 37–42.

   Poetics, the second book of, evidence for its existence, 1–9.

   tradition of a second book criticized, 9–36.

Armorum Iudicium, 164.

Bacchae, 182, 185.

Benoît de Sainte-Maure, 65 ff.

Boccaccio as a source of Chaucer's *Troilus*, 92 ff., 110 ff.

   attitude towards sources, 64.

   relation of Chaucer to, 61, 63 ff.

Boccaccio's *Filostrato*, 50 ff., 65 ff., 72, 92 ff.

Boccaccio's *Teseide*, 50 ff., 64 ff.

   as a source of Chaucer's *Troilus*, 110 ff.

   relation of, to Statius's *Thebaid*, 121 ff.

Boethius and Chaucer, 58.

Browning, repetition in *The Ring and the Book*, 188, 190.

Character, evolution of, in the *Oresteia*, 144–148.

Chaucer, *Anelida and Arcite*, st. 1–10.

   Canterbury Tales, relation to sources of certain, 57, 60 ff., 119.

   House of Fame (1468), 47 ff.

Chaucer's *Lollius*, 47–133.

Chaucer's *Troilus*, 49 ff., 54, 59 ff., 71.

   sources of, references to, 92 ff.

Choephoroe, 139–142, 144–146, 148–149, 151, 179–180, 186, 191, 194, 199, 202, 203, 205–206, 213–214, 222.

Chorus, important in the trilogy of the *Supplices*, 157–158.

   one cause of repeated exposition, 184–185.

   frequent medium for exposition, 202–205.

   in Aeschylus, 202, 223

Classical antiquity, errors concerning persons of, in Chaucer and other mediaeval writers, 80 ff.

Danaides, 157–158.

Dante, influence on Boccaccio, 120.

   on Chaucer, 120.

Dryden, on construction of Greek tragedies, 165–166.

Electra, 171, 182, 183, 192, 200, 203, 204, 209, 216, 220.

Eumenides, 142–143, 147, 149, 151–152, 180–181, 184, 186, 191, 194, 203, 209, 214, 222–223.

Euripides, prologue of, 182–183, 186–187.

Exposition, distributive, in Aeschylus, 170, 192–201.

   in Sophocles, 199–200.

   in Euripides, 200–201.

   in the trilogy, 159–161.

INDEX OF IMPORTANT CITATIONS

HARVARD STUDIES

IN

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

**Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors of
Harvard University.**

PUBLISHED BY THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I, 1890.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II, 1891.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME III, 1892.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IV, 1893.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME V, 1894.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI, 1895.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VII, 1896.

The articles in this volume are contributed by former pupils and colleagues of Professor George Martin Lane, in commemoration of the happy completion of fifty years since he received his first degree in Arts from Harvard College.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VIII, 1897.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IX, 1898.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME X, 1899.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XI, 1900.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XI (continued).

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XII, 1901.

The articles in this volume are contributed by former pupils and colleagues of Professor William Watson Goodwin, in commemoration of the happy completion of fifty years since he received his first degree in Arts from Harvard College, and of forty-one years since he became Eliot Professor.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIII, 1902.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIV, 1903.

This volume is dedicated to the memory of Professor James Bradstreet Greenough, through whose efforts the publication fund was secured, and to whom, in large measure, the success of the Studies is due.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV, 1904.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVI, 1905.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVII, 1906.

The articles in this volume are contributed by instructors in the Department of the Classics as a token of affection and esteem for Clement Lawrence Smith, of the class of 1863, for thirty-four years a valued member of the Department, but forced by ill health to resign the Pope Professorship of Latin in this University in 1904.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVIII, 1907.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIX, 1908.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XX, 1909.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXI, 1910.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXII, 1911.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXIII, 1912.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXIV, 1913.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXV, 1914.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXVI, 1915.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXVII, 1916.